



Attachments

Planning and Strategy Committee

Notice is hereby given that an Planning and Strategy Committee of Council will be held at Council Chambers, 1 Belgrave Street, Manly, on:

Monday 1 March 2010

Commencing at 7:30:00 PM for the purpose of considering items included on the Agenda.

Persons in the gallery are advised that the proceedings of the meeting are being taped. However, under the Local Government Act 1993, no other tape recording is permitted without the authority of the Council or Committee. Tape recording includes a video camera and any electronic device capable of recording speech.

*Copies of business papers are available at the Customer Services Counter at Manly Council, Manly Library and Seaforth Library and are available on Council's website:
www.manly.nsw.gov.au*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item Page No.

PLANNING AND STRATEGY DIVISION

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 5

MV Baragoola Ferry – former State Heritage Register listed item

AT1: Copy of the NSW Heritage Council Minutes July October and November 2009..... 2

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6

Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

AT1: Executive Summary, North Harbour Coastline Management Plan 9

AT2: Proposed Management Options 14

AT3: Submissions from Public Exhibition 18

******* END OF ATTACHMENTS *******

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 5 - MV Baragoola Ferry – former State Heritage Register listed item.

Copy of the NSW Heritage Council Minutes July October and November 2009

Copy of the NSW Heritage Council minutes (July, October and November 2009) regarding the de-listing of the MV Baragoola from the State Heritage register. Sourced from the NSW Heritage Branch website.

HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW
MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING
Meeting Number 349
1st July 2009

Heritage Branch Department of Planning Parramatta

PRESENT Gabrielle Kibble (Chair), Tom Gellibrand (Department of Planning), Russell Couch (for Director-General Department of Environment and Climate Change), Tina Jackson, Danny Chapman Julie Bindon, Peter Mould (Government Architect), Rosemary Annable, Petula Samios (for Director General, Department of Planning), John Neish

APOLOGIES Sharon Sullivan (Deputy Chair), David Logan, Ross Fitzgerald

ALSO PRESENT

Michael Clarke (SHR Committee) Heritage Branch Staff: Tim Smith, Cameron White, Colleen Klingberg

1. Opening – Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 9.00am.

1.2 Confirmation and Timing of Agenda

The agenda was confirmed.

1.3 Declarations of Interest

Pecuniary Interests Nil

Non Pecuniary Interests Nil

Conflicts of Interest Nil

2.0 Matters for Consideration and Decision

2.1 M.V. Baragoola – Recommendation to de-list

The members received a report on the recommendation to de-list the Ex-Manly Ferry, "mv Baragoola". The vessel currently moored at Coal Loader Wharf, Waverton, is a double ended steel-hulled diesel electric former Manly ferry. The vessel is currently owned by the 'They Group' Pty Ltd. Tim Smith provided the members a presentation on the history of the vessel, the condition reports received and submissions received following the advertisement of the Intention to Consider De-listing. New members were also advised of previous discussions and decisions from Heritage Council meetings. The presentation also included information on comparative vessels such as mv North Head and the State Heritage Register listed South Steyne.

Members were advised that the present owner of the mv Baragoola historic ferry has written to the Heritage Branch to seek Heritage Council consideration to de-list the vessel from the State Heritage Register (9 April 2009). The owner's representative, Adrian Thompson ("They Group" Pty Ltd.) purchased the vessel in November 2008 and contends that the vessel is beyond salvation and no longer warrants listing as an item of State heritage significance, due to its poor condition and lack of integrity.

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 5 - MV Baragoola Ferry – former State Heritage Register listed item.

Copy of the NSW Heritage Council Minutes July October and November 2009

Following this request, an Intention to consider de-listing was advertised for comment for 14 days: 16 May 2009 to 1 June 2009. The advertising period was extended for a further 3 weeks until 22 June 2009 (5 weeks total). Letters were issued to all known stakeholders and notices published in the Sydney Morning Herald, Daily Telegraph, and Manly Daily newspapers. A visual inspection by the Heritage Branch in December 2008 confirmed the deteriorated condition of the vessel. This report was substantiated by an independent professional naval surveyor's assessment conducted in February 2009 by Boat Check. This condition survey was instigated at the request of the Heritage Council and funded by the Department. Importantly, the report identifies that significant new replacement work (in the vicinity of 65% of original fabric) may be required of the hull, decks and upper works, to maintain a seaworthy and stable condition. This is considered a conservative estimate and does not include the below deck machinery and plant items which are also in an advanced state of deterioration and no longer operable, nor areas of structure not visually accessible.

The vessel was previously converted to a 'dumb barge' (unpowered) with removal of propellers and sealing of shafts. Members also received a copy of a peer review report prepared by P.J.P. Marine on the condition survey by Boat Check. The P.J.P. Marine report also funded by the Department, advised that the Boat Check report is seen as a present condition report of the vessel and does clearly demonstrate that the vessel is in poor condition. It also advises that whilst the report does cover the overall condition of the vessel's hull, deck and machinery systems on the vessel, it also provided a brief past history of its operation of the vessel as a Sydney ferry.

P.J.P. Marine concluded that the Boat Check report provided information that they in agree with and fully support the view that this vessel is presently in imminent danger of sinking at its berth. P.J.P. Marine concurs with the assessment by Boat Check and therefore advises that immediate action is required to determine the future of the mv Baragoola. Members were advised that the Heritage Branch has identified that de-listing might be warranted due to the advanced deterioration of original fabric and the amount of change that would be required to sustain the item. This could be deemed to affect the original listing on integrity grounds, reducing its State heritage significance. Delisting would not compromise future potential projects aimed at reconstructing the vessel with substantive replacement of materials. It would mean that Heritage Council approvals would not be required for future works, including relocation and rebuilding.

Presentations

The members received a presentation from the present owner of the mv Baragoola Mr Adrian Thompson of the 'They Group' Pty Ltd. Mr Thompson advised that he found the mv Baragoola on the web for sale, prior to the sale he had a brief meeting with the boat broker on the boat and only had a short time to inspect the upper decks of the vessel. After purchasing the vessel he was able to make a fuller inspection at which time he came to the conclusion that the vessel is beyond its use-by date. Mr Thompson advised work carried out previously was mainly cosmetic and to repair the vessel could cost up to \$15 million. Mr Thompson advised that he did not have access to funds to carry out this work and make it a viable business. Mr Thompson advised that he operates the Port Stephens Ferry Service having four vessels under his management. He also advised that his initial plan for the vessel was to move it to Port Stephens, anchor the vessel in the harbour and utilise it for a viewing platform to watch dolphins. The vessel would have also provided a mooring location for other boats and had the potential to house a shop like kiosk and be fitted out with 15-20 cabins. Mr Thompson advised that if the vessel was de-listed he would be looking at scrapping the vessel. He has already placed it on Ebay with no real interest – but has not tried a public auction due to the costs involved. The members thanked Mr Thompson for presenting to the meeting. Mr Thompson left the meeting.

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 5 - MV Baragoola Ferry – former State Heritage Register listed item.

Copy of the NSW Heritage Council Minutes July October and November 2009

The members received a presentation from Mr Richard Pool on behalf of P.J.P. Marine who carried out the peer review on the Boat Check report. Mr Pool advised that he is a Marine Engineer and Archaeologist, with over 35 years experience in heritage conservation, development and management including adaptive reuse of historic buildings and structures. Mr Pool advised that the Boat Check report is the result of a visual inspection and is not a record resulting from a marine survey where structural or other deficiencies would be fully detailed. He agreed with the Boat Check in the matter of oils remaining on board and the potential risk of environmental pollution should the ship sink. Mr Pool advised that he did visit the vessel at its current mooring on the 17th Nov 2008. The exterior of the ship was in a visually poor state, a state that he would understand as being the result of lack of any recent maintenance. The steel hull was clearly showing signs of deterioration with metal corrosion evident throughout. The state of hull is of concern and indicates a prolonged lack of maintenance that will result in continued and increasing water infiltration and ultimately hull failure. The ship's hull requires urgent attention and without which, there is real danger that the vessel will sink at its berth. He advised that the current practice of intermittent ship keeping and bilge pump out is unsatisfactory and offers no real protection for the ship especially in the event of a major structural component failure to the ship's hull. Concern also was raised over the possible chemical leakage from failed batteries which would find its way into the bilges where these liquids could stimulate corrosive reactions, possibly form dangerous gases and be a pollutant risk should the ship sink. As the vessel is not in commercial survey and has not been for some time, the owners are not subject to statutory obligations of a vessel in survey requiring ongoing maintenance to meet certification. A vessel that is not properly maintained will deteriorate and over time will result in becoming a total loss.

In summary Mr Pool advised that based on the reports and observations from his visit in November, his knowledge of the vessel, marine engineering practice and experience in heritage conservation and restoration; that the vessel exhibits hull deterioration throughout and the vessel is in real danger of sinking at its berth. He also advised that preservation of our maritime heritage is a costly business both in time and money. All heritage projects require a coherent plan that sets out clearly the objective and how preservation is to be achieved. He also advised that the restoration of James Craig took over 20 years and at a cost of some \$20M. This was achieved with a detailed development plan, public and corporate support and the contribution of hundreds of volunteers. Mr Pool advised that the mv Baragoola is a Heritage Item, very much an important part of Australia's oldest urban transport system. The vessel's conversion from steam to diesel/electric power is a very important part ship building history in Sydney.

The members thanked Mr Pool for his level and balanced presentation. Mr Pool left the meeting.

The members received a presentation from Mr Lance Lyon on behalf of the 'Baragoola Preservation Association'. Mr Lyon advised the members of the following.

The heritage significance of the mv Baragoola is that it is the sole remaining Balmain built vessel from Mort's Dockyard & Engineering Company of its type in Sydney. The largely unaltered vessel displays large scale Australian ship building techniques & materials from the 1920's. It is the only remaining vessel in near original "as built" design of six near-identical large vessels built for the Port Jackson & Manly Steamship Co and is a surviving example of the type of vessel that opened up the North Shore & Manly areas in the early part of the 20th century. Removal of Heritage Listing from the vessel may leave it open to destruction by scrapping or further neglect resulting in the destruction of a unique, remaining icon of Sydney's maritime fabric & heritage and large scale shipbuilding industry, a loss to future generations of our maritime past In response to the Heritage Council report they feel

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 5 - MV Baragoola Ferry – former State Heritage Register listed item.
Copy of the NSW Heritage Council Minutes July October and November 2009

that the examination of the vessel was cursory without proper investigative procedures and has led the Heritage Branch to believe that restoration of the vessel will require at least 65% of the vessels fabric to require replacement, thus negating the heritage value of the vessel. Without a full “out of water” inspection in a controlled & neutral environment, unaffected by commercially driven requirements, they feel that this cannot be used as the basis for delisting. The group presented their proposal for restoration of the vessel. They feel that the vessel should be removed from private ownership thus mitigating the chance of destruction for purely commercial gain. In conjunction with the Heritage Council and Marine Archaeologists, a suitable long term management plan should be enacted to stabilise, conserve and restore the vessel to a functional condition. They would develop a business plan sympathetic to the vessel’s history and suitable to the future usage of the vessel in both an historic and contemporary interpretation setting. They advised that currently their organisation is discussing the availability of a suitable and sympathetic site to begin immediate conservation work.

The following ideas were proposed for the future use of the vessel: Interpretive centre for Sydney’s maritime history; Functional cruising vessel; Floating convention centre with related facilities; Use by community groups; Hospitality facilities or other commercial uses (e.g. office & display space).

In conclusion Mr Lyon advised the members that the role of their organisation and website includes providing a single point of contact for all interested parties (e.g. media organisations, corporate sponsors, volunteers etc). The website allows the publicising of the organisation and their aims, promoting the vessel in a sympathetic light and keeps the vessel and its current situation in constant public awareness. It also allows coordinated responses to public commentary in relation to the vessel, regular factual updates on the vessel and provides historical information and images of the vessel.

The members thanked Mr Lyon for his enthusiastic presentation. Mr Lyon left the meeting.

The members discussed the reports, submissions and presentations that had been received. The members agreed that the mv Baragoola is in a poor physical state and will ultimately suffer a catastrophic failure. It was agreed that without a major capital injection the vessel may not be viable to restore. However, the members agreed that interested parties require more time to develop a viable business and management plan demonstrating that the vessel could be conserved into the future.

The members agreed to provide time to the interested parties and to review the matter at the October 2009 meeting.

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council of NSW:

1. notes the report and presentations received;
2. notes that from the independent advice and review of this advice that the mv Baragoola is in very poor structural condition which poses a potential serious risk to the item and the environment;
3. given the historic, aesthetic and social significance of the vessel and the potential risk outlined above, the Heritage Council would like to provide a period of no more than 3 months for those interested in retaining the vessel to develop a viable community / private business and management plan which provides evidence that the vessel can be conserved into the future;
4. requests the Heritage Branch to report to the Heritage Council at each meeting on progress and report back to the October 2009 meeting.

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 5 - MV Baragoola Ferry – former State Heritage Register listed item.

Copy of the NSW Heritage Council Minutes July October and November 2009

HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW MINUTES OF MEETING

Meeting Number 352

7th October 2009

Heritage Branch Department of Planning Parramatta

PRESENT David Logan, Ross Fitzgerald, Rosemary Annable, Peter Mould, John Neish, Julie Bindon, Petula Samios (for Director General, Department of Planning), Tom Gellibrand (Department of Planning), Russell Couch (for Director-General Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water)

APOLOGIES Gabrielle Kibble (Chair), Sharon Sullivan (Deputy Chair), Danny Chapman
ALSO PRESENT

Heritage Branch Staff: Tim Smith, Cameron White, Graham Williams and Alice Brandjes for presentation 4.3, Brewarrina Rock Ramp Fishway

In the absence of the Chair and Deputy Chair members agreed to Mr Tom Gellibrand acting as Chair for the meeting.

5.4 M.V. Baragoola – Recommendation to de-list

Tim Smith, Deputy Director, Heritage Branch, advised the Heritage Council that Mr Lyons had telephoned that morning stating that he was unable to make the presentation. Advice received from Mr Lyon was that the Baragoola Preservation Association was in discussions with the relevant authorities for a berth for the vessel at Cockatoo Island and for transfer of ownership. The Heritage Council considered the recommendation which proposed the delisting of the vessel from the State Heritage Register.

The Council was advised that the independent structural assessments obtained by the Heritage Branch had estimated that around 65% of the original fabric may require replacement. The Council debated various aspects of the question of leaving the vessel on the list, including mechanisms for exemptions appropriate to the level of replacement work required versus de-listing. It was noted that the "Minimum Standards of Maintenance" provisions, applicable under the Heritage Act to most State Heritage Register items, do not apply to moveable heritage items.

Members were of the view that further legal advice was needed prior to further discussion and requested legal advice be sought on the following matters:

- 1) To obtain advice that the appropriate wording to recommend removal of the item from the State Heritage Register, in keeping with the provisions of the Act and legal rigour:
- 2) The impact, if any, that the commencement of the Heritage Amendment Act 2009 will have with regard to the Heritage Council's deliberations on the matter.

In relation to the latter, the Heritage Council sought clarification on whether they could proceed with a decision based on the Heritage Act provisions prior to the Heritage Amendment Act no.34, and what affect any transitional arrangements had on their action.

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council of NSW:

1. to defer consideration of the matter to a special meeting of the Heritage Council on 4 November 2009

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 5 - MV Baragoola Ferry – former State Heritage Register listed item.
Copy of the NSW Heritage Council Minutes July October and November 2009

HERITAGE COUNCIL OF NSW MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Meeting Number 353

4th November 2009

Heritage Branch Department of Planning Parramatta

PRESENT Gabrielle Kibble (Chair), Sharon Sullivan (Deputy Chair), Danny Chapman, Julie Bindon, Rosemary Annable, John Neish, David Logan, Ross Fitzgerald, Peter Mould (Government Architect), Robert Goodman (for Director-General Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water), Tom Gellibrand (for Director General, Department of Planning)

APOLOGIES Nil

ALSO PRESENT

Heritage Branch Staff: Petula Samios, Tim Smith, Cameron White, Vincent Sicari, Colleen Klingberg

1. Opening – Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 9.00am.

The Chair advised the members that the Heritage Amendment Act 2009 commenced on 16 October and as such the appointments of David Logan and Rosemary Annable had ended as organisational representatives. The members were advised that both David and Rosemary had been re-appointed to the Heritage Council for their individual expertise effective from 16 October 2009.

1.2 Confirmation and Timing of Agenda

The agenda was confirmed noting no presentation would be occurring for the item

2.1 M.V. Baragoola – Recommendation to de-list. The members also received an updated report for consideration of this matter.

1.3 Declarations of Interest

Pecuniary Interests Nil

Non Pecuniary Interests Nil

Conflicts of Interest David Logan and Julie Bindon - Item 2.2

Bungarrabee Curtilage Amendment

2.0 Matters for Consideration and Decision

2.1 M.V. Baragoola – Recommendation to remove item

The Chair introduced the matter and noted that the item was discussed in detail at the October Special meeting. Tim Smith summarised the present state of discussions regarding the proposition to remove Baragoola from the State Heritage Register. He noted that at the time of presentation, ownership of the vessel is retained by Mr Adrian Thompson and that despite advice to the contrary, the Baragoola Preservation Society had not yet obtained custody and control of the ferry. Mr Thompson had recently confirmed that the vessel was taking water and required daily pumping. NSW Maritime Authority had also advised in writing (letter of 30 October 2009 tabled), that it would seek to have the vessel removed from the harbour as soon as practicable, not withstanding the heritage listing.

Mr Smith summarised the legal advice requested by the Heritage Council on two key matters. In relation to the wording detailing the reasoning for removing the item from the SHR, Legal Services Branch suggested the wording incorporated into draft resolutions 1) – 3) of the current report. In relation to the implications of the recent proclamation of the Heritage Amendment Act 2009, Mr Smith confirmed legal advice that the new provisions of

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 5 - MV Baragoola Ferry – former State Heritage Register listed item.

Copy of the NSW Heritage Council Minutes July October and November 2009

the Act are applicable to discussions regarding removal of the Baragoola from the SHR. This is because a formal decision on the matter had not been made by Council and recommended to the Minister. Ms Bindon noted that the legal advice should have been tabled for the benefit of Members. Mr Smith noted the Branch's advice that the legal report was subject to legal privileges, but confirmed that the current Heritage Council report contained an accurate and fair summary of the advice provided.

Members re-engaged discussion relative to the vessel no longer being of State heritage significance. Key issues included the current state of the vessel and its listed fabric, the amount of further change required, and the discussion on when the Baragoola ceases to retain heritage significance. Members unanimously agreed to recommend the removal of the site, from the State Heritage Register on the basis that the current condition has seriously undermined the original integrity of the vessel, its fabric and fittings, and that future works required to make the vessel safe as a floating exhibit will require additional substantive replacement of original materials with new. Members were satisfied that as a result of the vessel's condition it was no longer of State Heritage Significance. The scale of this additional work has been estimated in the vicinity of 65%. It is the members view that the scale of this activity and the poor current condition overall would result in substantive change to the vessel and its % of original fabric. In essence this activity would result in a replica of Baragoola being made, which would no longer be of State Heritage significance.

Members noted that removal of the listing would not preclude an interested body, such as the Baragoola Preservation Society, to undertake the rebuilding works that would safeguard the vessel, but that heritage approvals for this extensive works program would no longer be required.

The members endorsed the recommendations in the report and requested that the Chair assist in finalising an additional resolution to capture the reasoning behind Council's resolution to recommend to the Minister the item's removal from the Register. (included below).

Resolved:

That the Heritage Council of NSW:

1. considers that the MV Baragoola, located in Unincorporated Waters of NSW, be removed from the State Heritage Register, being no longer of State heritage significance, and notes that:

a. based on the advice of the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning and independent experts, that the integrity of the item has been irrevocably altered by its current poor physical state.

b. the original fabric is so degraded that retention of the vessel will require substantial intervention and replacement with new materials and that this action will further diminish the vessel's significance values.

2. determines, having considered the submissions received in response to the notice of intention to remove the listing, to recommend to the Minister under section 33(1)(d) of the Heritage Act 1977, to remove the listing of the item known as MV Baragoola, located in Unincorporated Waters of NSW, from the State Heritage Register;

3. gives notice of its decision in accordance with section 33 (1) (e) of the Heritage Act 1977;

4. recommends to the Minister, under section 33(1)(f) of the Heritage Act 1977 that the Minister form an opinion that the item known as the MV Baragoola is not of State heritage significance and that the Minister direct this item be removed from the State Heritage Register in accordance with section 38(1)(a) of the Heritage Act 1977, as soon as possible after notice of the Heritage Council's decision is given.

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan
Executive Summary, North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Executive Summary, North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

About the Plan

This Plan is prepared through the process outlined in the NSW Coastline Management Manual. Extensive community consultation was conducted through mechanisms including, display panels, information sharing through Precinct newsletters and Council's webpage, formal questionnaire surveys and community Field Days.

This Plan addresses the northern portion of the North Harbour (part of Port Jackson / Sydney Harbour) and foreshore that lies within the Manly Local Government Area boundary. North Harbour study area extends both seaward and landward from the shoreline between Federation Point and Wellings Reserve. The study area covers approximately 180 hectares and takes in the suburbs of Fairlight, Balgowlah and Balgowlah Heights including Precinct Community Forum areas of Fairlight, North Harbour and Balgowlah Heights. The entire study area is covered within the Sydney Harbour Foreshores and Waterways Area and also within the Sydney Metropolitan Catchment Area.

The Plan has been developed in response to legislative requirements and community issues in accordance with current best practices for the management of estuaries and its catchment. The development of this Coastline Management Plan is identified in Manly Plan 2009-2012 and Sustainability Strategy 2006.

Preparation of this EMP is an action C1.3.1 (*develop and implement comprehensive Coastline Management Plans (CMPs) for all areas of foreshore in Manly*) of the Manly Sustainability Strategy 2006 (MC 2006). It supports strategy 'E2.1: Improve health of waterways, coasts and estuaries' of the draft North East Subregional Strategy (DoP 2007).

The Plan addresses the following six broad based key issues, derived from community consultations:

- Aquatic/intertidal habitat conservation & management,
- Bushland/terrestrial habitat conservation & management,
- Upgrading of Public Facilities,
- North Harbour Reserve Improvement
- Hazards & climate change, and
- Heritage conservation & management

This Coastline Management Plan is a strategic plan with a long-term time frame of 15- 20 years and firmed up implementation program of 5 years. This plan will be reviewed and revised every 5 years and a new implementation program will be adopted in line with priorities of the period.

This Coastline Management Plan has evolved through incorporation of strategic directions from a number of Council's management documents and land use planning instruments. In order to embed coastline management as part of Council's core business, the adopted Plan will link into documents such as: Manly Plan, Manly Sustainability Strategy, Coastline & Estuary Management Plans, Manly Local Environmental Plan, Development Control Plans (DCPs), and Plans of Management.

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Executive Summary, North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK & MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

A series of goals and objectives for the future management of the North Harbour area were developed on the basis of information received through community and stakeholder consultation. For each management issue a goal has been defined, along with a range of management objectives that have been further translated into management options. The Plan follows the four basic principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) and also considers the State Plan, state-wide targets set by the Natural Resources Commission and regional targets set by the Sydney Metropolitan Catchment Management Authority (SMCMA).

This Plan sets six Goals and 21 Objectives to be addressed through 48 Management Options . Only 30 of these are new activities. Of these 30, three management options are proposed for immediate implementation, 19 within 2 years, seven within 3-4 years and only 1 at later years. Overall, 17 management options have been rated to have high priority, 30 as medium priority and only one as low priority.

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Strategic management options cover a wide range of structural and non-structural solutions. These are briefly summarised here addressing each of the six key management issues.

Options addressing Aquatic/Intertidal Habitat Conservation & Management

A total of 10 management options are proposed to address four objectives: expansion of North Harbour Aquatic Reserve, protection of areas of ecological significance, preservation of seagrass and kelp beds and ensuring that water quality is suitable for healthy natural habitat conservation.

Of these, eight management options have been rated as of high priority and relate to extension of the boundary of North Harbour Aquatic Reserve, assisting DECC with preparation and implementation of North Harbour Aquatic Reserve Management Plan, managing Wildlife Protected Area at Federation Point, assessing marine biodiversity, protection of soldier crab colony, supporting conservation of seagrass and kelp beds, investigate feasibility of Stormwater Quality Improvement Devices (SQIDs) and place screens on minor stormwater outfalls. Further two management options have medium priority.

Three management options are already on-going activities. None has been proposed for immediate implementation.

Options addressing Bushland/Terrestrial Habitat Conservation & Management

A total of eight management options are proposed to address three objectives: continuation of Council's bushland management program, reduction of weed cover and encouraging community participation.

Of these, one has been rated as of high priority and relate to Community Bush Care Volunteers program. However, six management options have medium priority. Three of the management options are on-going activities. One option that has been proposed for immediate implementation relates to obtain SEPP 19 status for Heathcliff Reserve.

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan
Executive Summary, North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Options addressing Upgrading & Enhancement of Public Facilities

A total of 10 management options are proposed to address four objectives: improvements to general amenities, safe accessibility to public places, facilitating dog walking and sustainable recreational fishing.

Of these, three management options have been rated as of high priority and relate to continuation of ban on commercial fishing, monitor Dioxin levels in Sydney Harbour waters and facilitate recreational fishing. Seven management options have medium priority.

Six of the management options are on-going activities. One option that has been proposed for immediate implementation relate to facilities for Scuba divers near Fairlight pool.

Options addressing North Harbour Reserve Improvement

A total of six management options are proposed to address four objectives: health safety issues, masterplan for the Reserve, assessing irrigation options and improved disable access.

Of these, one has been rated as of high priority, four as medium and the remaining one as low priority management options. The only high management option relates to preparation of Landscape Masterplan for North Harbour Reserve.

None of the management options are on-going activities. Two options proposed for immediate implementation relate to investigations to ascertain any health risk in soil and preparation of landscape Masterplan for North Harbour Reserve.

Options addressing Hazards & Climate Change

A total of 12 management options are proposed to address four objectives: risk reduction to slope and cliff instability, risk reduction from beach erosion and shoreline recession, impacts of sea level rise adaptation and mitigation measures in relation to climate change impacts.

Two high priority management option relate to continuation of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures and information to community regarding known impacts of climate change. Ten management options are categorised in medium priority.

Four of the management options are on-going activity. None has been proposed for immediate implementation.

It should be mentioned that many of the proposed management options and related actions will eventually be guided by Council's proposed *Climate Change Risk Assessment and Adaptation Action Plan* (being drafted) and the Council's proposed Carbon Neutral Plan (yet to be drafted).

Options addressing Heritage Conservation & Management

A total of two management options are proposed to address two objectives: protection of all sites of Aboriginal heritage significance and sites of natural and cultural heritage.

Both two of the management options are on-going activities of Council and rated as of having high priority.

FUNDING REQUIREMENTS

The total cost of implementing (including 1-5 years of operation and maintenance) the 48 management options addressing six key management issues is \$889,000 (**Table**).

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Executive Summary, North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Table : Summary of estimated cost

Management Issues	Number of Management Options	Estimated Indicative Cost (\$)			
		High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	Total
Aquatic Habitat	10	160,000	0	0	160,000
Terrestrial Habitat	8	50,000	220,000	0	270,000
Enhancement of Facilities	10	11,000	198,000	0	209,000
North Harbour Reserve	6	0	120,000	5,000	125,000
Hazards & Climate Change	12	85,000	40,000	0	125,000
Heritage Conservation	2	0	0	0	0
	48	295,000	569,000	5,000	889,000

Some actions require an on-going commitment from existing staff rather than the outlay of expenditure and this is noted as 'Time'. Some recommended actions require significant capital costs, especially where large-scale works are involved such as widening & upgrading of access road, installation of SQIDs, construction of paved footpaths.

As indicated elsewhere, implementation responsibility of all proposed management options rests with a number of agencies including Manly Council. Hence, adoption of this CMP does not commit Council to allocate immediate funding. Funding from different alternative sources will be pursued. These include but are not limited to:

- Council's Environment Levy (subject to a budget bid process);
- Council's General Revenue Budget (subject to a budget bid process);
- State Government's Coastal Management Program (50% subsidy funding subject to a submission process);
- NSW Coastal Catchments Initiative; and
- Other Commonwealth and State Government funded programs such as SSHAP, MIP, Greenspace, CMA Funding etc.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Agencies involved: Manly Council (MC) is the principal implementation/management agency of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan. Responsibility for implementing the options is spread across local government (planning, management and works staff), state government agencies and volunteer community groups. The following agencies will likely be involved in implementation of one or more relevant management options either in the main or supporting roles.

- NSW Department of Environment. Climate Change and Water (DECCW);
- NSW Maritime;
- Industry & Investment NSW (I&I NSW);
- Sydney Metropolitan Catchment Management Authority (SMCMA);
- Sydney Coastal Councils Group (SCCG); and
- Aboriginal Heritage Office (AHO);

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Executive Summary, North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Implementation Time frame: Of 48 management options proposed in this CMP, 18 options are on-going activities of the Council and/or other agencies. Among newly proposed 30 options, three have been proposed for immediate implementation, 20 within two years, six within 3-4 years and only one on 5th or later years.

Mainstreamed into the Council's Management Plan: The management options proposed in this Coastline Management Plan will gradually be mainstreamed in to the rolling three year Manly Plan. The Manly Plan is the key planning document driving the operations of Council. Efforts will be made to incorporate priority options in to the next Manly Plan 2010 – 2013 and subsequent Plans.

Collaborative Partnership with other agencies and neighbouring Councils: Manly Council, as being the main implementer of the CMP, plans to conclude collaborative partnership agreements with other relevant agencies and neighbouring Councils either specifically for this CMP or for overall LGA.

Manly Harbour Foreshores & Coastline Management Committee to coordinate: Manly Harbour Foreshores & Coastline Management Committee will co-ordinate implementation of the CMP. The Committee, will be serviced by the Coastal Management Team of Council

Opportunities for community involvement: Many of the management strategies adopted for North Harbour area offer opportunities for community involvement particularly activities such as bush regeneration projects, participatory monitoring programs and environmental education, as well as general monitoring of plan implementation and effectiveness.

Reporting through four mechanisms: Reporting on implementation of the CMP will be achieved through four mechanisms: internal Council reporting process, Annual Reports to the community, Council website and regular Harbour Foreshore Committee meetings.

CMP to be reviewed every 5 years: The Coastline Management Plan will be reviewed every 5 years to accommodate priorities of the period, requirements of new/amended legislations and Council's policies and guidelines. During the process, there will be a mechanism to identify new issues and conflicts concerning the coastline management and ensure their incorporation into a revised plan. A program for the following 5 years will be developed by designating priority to any new actions and reassigning priority to the remaining actions. These programs should be fed back into and form the revised CMP for the next 5 years.

MONITORING, EVALUATION & REPORTING

Monitoring & evaluation is a key component of any coastline/estuary management plan. At present, Council has no structured & written monitoring plan to assess environmental health of coast & estuary. However, the SHOROC State of the Environment Report, prepared annually in collaboration with other regional Councils, provides numerical data on a comprehensive range of indicators. Long-term water quality monitoring data is, however, available at present from the 'Harbour Watch Program' and 'Beach Watch Program' of the Department of Environment and Climate Change (DECC). The National NRM Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (NM&EF) has identified a total of 19 nationally agreed indicators to measure the effect of the stressors on ecosystem condition (physical/chemical and biological) and habitat extent. Based on this, 25 indicators have been proposed to monitor Manly's Estuarine, Coastal & Marine Habitat Integrity.

ATTACHMENT 2

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Proposed Management Options

ATTACHMENT 2: Proposed Management Options

Strategic Management Options	Implementation Timeframe*	Priority
AH1.1. Pursue a submitted proposal to extend the boundary of North Harbour Aquatic Reserve.	On-going	High
AH1.2. Assist DECCW with preparation and implementation of North Harbour Aquatic Reserve Management Plan.	Within 2 years	High
AH2.1. Pursue & process to declare inter-tidal areas as 'Inter-tidal Protected Area' under the <i>Fisheries Management Act</i> .	Within 2 years	Medium
AH2.2. Continue managing Wildlife Protected Area at Federation Point.	On-going	High
AH2.3 Assess marine biodiversity of North Harbour including Aquatic Reserve.	Within 2 years	High
AH2.4. Locate soldier crab colony at the far west end of North Harbour and undertake protection measures	Within 3-4 years	High
AH3.1. Continue to encourage I&I NSW to support conservation of seagrass and kelp beds.	On-going	High
AH3.2. Work with NSW Maritime and I&I NSW to introduce seagrass friendly moorings	Within 3-4 years	Medium
AH4.1. Investigate feasibility of Stormwater Quality Improvement Devices (SQIDs) on major stormwater outlets that discharge into North Harbour to ensure healthy aquatic habitat.	Within 2 years	High
AH4.2. Place screens on minor stormwater outfalls to improve water quality and aquatic health	Within 3-4 years	High
TH1.1. To structure systematic and continued bushland management, prepare a comprehensive management plan (in conjunction with Precincts) and develop a staged implementation programme.	Within 3-4 years	Medium
TH1.2. Prepare site specific management plans for Nolan Bush and West Esplanade Park, the two SEPP 19 bushland, to fulfil statutory requirement.	Within 2 years	Medium
TH1.3. Initiate processes to obtain SEPP 19 status for Heathcliff Reserve.	Immediate	Medium

ATTACHMENT 2

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Proposed Management Options

Strategic Management Options	Implementati on Timeframe*	Priority
TH1.4 Prepare and implement Walkway Landscape Masterplan – Federation Point to Lauderdale Ave.	Within 2 years	Medium
TH2.1. Continue enhanced weeding program at high weed density areas on a priority basis.	On-going	Medium
TH2.2. Investigate sources of nutrient – rich discharges at stormwater outlets located in bushland and implement appropriate control measures.	Within 3-4 years	Medium
TH3.1. Continue Community Bush Care Volunteers program in the study area.	On-going	High
TH3.2. Continue Council’s Street Tree Planting Programme within the study area and initiate assessment of the programme.	On-going	Medium
PF1.1. Enhance general amenities for public use	On-going	Medium
PF1.2 Improve and facilitate traffic management around public reserves and beaches	On-going	Medium
PF1.3 Audit and remove unused watercrafts stored on foreshores within the study area with provision of dinghy and kayak storage facility in future.	Within 2 years	Medium
PF1.4 Organise facilities for Scuba divers near Fairlight pool.	Within 2 years	Medium
PF2.1 Construct paved footpath on Lower Beach Street from Condamine Street towards the shore	Within 5 th year	Medium
PF2.2 Audit disability access of all parks and bays within the study area.	Within 2 years	Medium
PF3.1 Install adequate dog faeces bins, water bowl and bag dispensers.	On-going	Medium
PF4.1 Support continuation of ban on commercial fishing.	On-going	High
PF4.2 Encourage relevant agencies to continue to monitor Dioxin levels in Sydney Harbour waters.	On-going	High

ATTACHMENT 2

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Proposed Management Options

PF4.3	Facilitate recreational fishing and work with NSW DPI to educate community about rules and regulations applying to recreational fisher (bag limits, size limits and species types) through NSW Fishcare Program.	On-going	High
NR1.1.	Carry out necessary investigations to ascertain any health risk in soil and sediments at North Harbour Reserve.	Immediate	Medium
NR2.1	Prepare and implement a Landscape Masterplan for North Harbour Reserve, in consultation with Precincts and community.	Immediate	High
NR3.1	Assess recycling of stormwater to irrigate North Harbour Reserve.	Within 2 years	Medium
NR4.1	Widen and upgrade access paths leading to and within North Harbour Reserve.	Within 2 years	Medium
NR4.2	Locate and investigate suitability of graded wheel chair access	Within 2 years	Medium
NR4.3	Investigate provision of improved parking facility at North Harbour Reserve.	Within 2 years	Low
HR1.1.	For hazards that are located on private property, owners are contacted, reminded of the identified hazards and recommended to undertake inspections and stabilization works where required.	Within 2 years	Medium
HR2.1.	Monitor shoreline changes of Fairlight Beach and damage, if any, of foreshore structures	Within 2 years	Medium
HR2.2.	Ensure future development of Fairlight Beach is compatible with erosion and recession hazards including impacts of climate change	Within 4 years	Medium
HR2.3.	Ensure any protective works minimise impact on beach amenity and access, and where practical improve existing amenity and access	On-going	Medium
HR2.4.	Encourage DECCW to carry out photogrammetric analysis periodically or after major storm events.	As needed	Medium
HR3.1	Assess specific impacts of sea level rise on North Harbour Reserve and devise adaptive measures.	Within 2 years	Medium

ATTACHMENT 2

Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan

Proposed Management Options

HR3.2	Assess impact of climate change on areas of ecological significance and devise adaptive measures.	Within 2 years	Medium
HR3.3	Work with Sydney Coastal Councils Group to develop regional/ local level climate change model considering protection provided by existing seawalls and rocky foreshores.	On-going	Medium
HR3.4	Promote environmentally- friendly sea walls while upgrading existing seawalls or constructing new seawalls.	Within 2 years	Medium
HR4.1	Continue with on-going climate change mitigation and adaptation measures	On-going	High
HR4.2	Collect and collate new information and knowledge on climate change impacts relevant to the study area/ Manly LGA.	Within 2 years	Medium
HR4.3	Inform and involve community through Precincts about known impacts of climate change on the study area.	Within 2 years	High
HC1.1.	Review Aboriginal Site Management Report for Manly Council (2006) and associated reports to prioritise management needs and develop a plan of implementation.	On-going	High
HC2.1.	Ensure physical protection and maintenance of all heritage listed items.	On-going	High

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

Submissions from Public Exhibition

SUMMARY

Submissions received, total of 27.

Submissions received from

- 23 individuals
- 2 Precincts
- 1 commercial establishment (Davis Marina)
- 1 NGO (Ecodivers)

Type of submissions

- 13 submissions dealt with multiple issues,
- 13 single issue (North Harbour Reserve improvement, board walk, dinghy racks, Café/Kiosk, public wharf) and
- 1 (not CMP related, concerned with Nth Head Treatment Plant)

Three debatable issues Identified (Comments highlighted)

- Proposed Public Wharf (PF 1.5)

“I would like to state my vehement opposition to the consideration of a boat launching facility at North Harbour. My opposition is based on increased traffic, destroy NHR’s integrity and recreational value, increased motor boat traffic and impact on marine biodiversity”

“The proposed wharf is a terrible idea. Hopefully, this is not being considered seriously.”

“Strongly support proposal for public access wharf. This could work well in conjunction with one of the marine businesses who could provide supervision/management.”

“This is long overdue and should be a high priority. There are no public wharf in North Harbour to service the large numbers of craft on public moorings.”

“Wharves at North harbour reserve can only do more damage to the environment in the long run.”

“Please don’t damage the area by ill conceived public works – for example, the public wharf “

“A proper wharf would be a benefit to the area. This wharf could be built where the original swimming enclosure was built. The steps are still there – (see recent Manly Daily feature on the original pool. This wharf would service the marine users 24/7.”

“The suggestion of a public wharf is absurd and is the very type of development that must be prevented. Too much of the foreshore is already given away to the boating industry.”

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

“The Precinct supports the investigation of options for a public wharf but only on the condition that the wider community input is sought and taken into account in making any recommendations.”

“We believe there should be a public wharf in North Harbour but any public wharf should be accessible to an Ambulance.”

Harbour Foreshores & Coastline Management Committee decision (08 December 2009)

The Committee saw more merit in having such a public wharf in Manly Cove rather than in North Harbour study area.

- New issue – Cafe / Kiosk at Fairlight

“I do think, however, that the majority of residents and visitors will regard Kiosk/Café proposal as a major positive benefit.”

“There is a community need for and I would like to see a kiosk at Fairlight pool”

“Please don’t damage the area by ill conceived commercial developments – for example, the café at Fairlight Beach “

“Extensively discussed – many arguments for & against”.

Harbour Foreshores & Coastline Management Committee decision (08 December 2009)

The Committee was divided over the issue of considering a Café/Kiosk at Fairlight and voted 2 in favour, 4 against and 2 abstained

- New issue – Boardwalk along foreshores

“That the Manly Scenic Walkway be extended (to enable wheelchair/pram access) from rear No.93 Lauderdale Ave Fairlight along the foreshore via a boardwalk initially to North Harbour Reserve, and subsequently to Davis Marina.”

“My recommendations are a boardwalk around the foreshore at North Harbour Reserve for safety, aesthetics and practicality.”

Harbour Foreshores & Coastline Management Committee decision (08 December 2009)

The Committee rejected the idea of the proposed boardwalk.

	Comments as Written	Staff Response
1.	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Plan of Management for North Harbour. I support all the aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity	<i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based</i>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>conservation and climate change mitigation measures. However, I would like to state my vehement opposition to the consideration of a boat launching facility at North Harbour. These funds can be better spent elsewhere. My opposition is based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic congestion in Condamine St is already at saturation and the potholes in Condamine St are in dire need of repair. There is no capacity for the increased traffic associated with a boat ramp. <p>Boat ramp access and parking needs would destroy the integrity and cultural recreational value of the park and conflict with current users. Park usage is already very high in summer and on weekends and again, there is not the capacity.</p> 2. Increased motor boat traffic in North Harbour. One of the major attractions of this part of the harbour (for humans and wildlife) is its tranquillity and lack of through traffic. This would be severely impacted upon by motor boats from a boat ramp as well as increasing noise pollution and shore wash erosion. 3. Impact on marine biodiversity. Endangered Little Penguins forage in North Harbour regularly and would be at increased risk of propeller cuts. We have also seen an increase in pelicans and cormorants in this area and increased traffic is likely to impact on their foraging behaviour. 4. Thank you for taking these comments on board. I would appreciate an acknowledgement of receipt and a response indicating final thoughts on the boat ramp proposal. I do not support this idea being investigated further. 	<p><i>on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p>
<p>2.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Repair/replace steps adjacent to 13 North Harbour Street, Balgowlah 2. The area around the picnic tables/seats/benches (near childrens play area) is a dirt/dust bowl. It is the most unhygienic/unpleasant place to sit. Because of the popularity of the area, it is impossible for grass to grow. A simple solution would be for say a one meter surround of the rubberized matting used in the childrens play area. 3. Strengthen rock wall on harbour side of reserve and renew concrete pathway east to west and widen pathway to same width as scenic walkway from Manly 4. At King Avenue end, replace single BB facility with double BB 5. Investigate garbage disposal bins at either end further away from BB areas 	<p><i>Agreed. These aspects are all accommodated in the draft North Harbour CMP.</i></p> <p><i>No further change required in the draft</i></p> <p><i>North Harbour Reserve Landscape Masterplan is now in preparation considering many of these aspects</i></p>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>6. Picnic table/seats on grassed area on Lower Beach Street (opposite Café and alongside parking area)</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>Anyone walking around the foreshore below Wellings Reserve would be appalled at the large number of discarded dinghies and kayaks strewn on the sand, rocks and in the bushes. Most of these crafts are unseaworthy and have not been used in years. They create an eyesore in their present state of neglect.</p> <p>Recently a couple of new dinghies have appeared. In one case, someone has hacked out a large area of the natural bushland for their boat. In another instance, two runabouts have been deposited on the rocks at North Harbour, thereby forcing people to walk on the slippery rocks. Since when do runabouts have precedence over people walking around the foreshore?</p> <p>None of these crafts are registered or insured and, if an accident were to occur, who would be liable? Could Manly Council be held responsible?</p> <p>Pittwater Council has already resolved the problem that it had with old dinghies and kayaks on Narrabeen Lake by making owners register the water craft, and if the owner cannot be found it is either auctioned off or destroyed. Come on Manly Council, get your act together and clean up this mess.</p> <p>(Letter by the Author to Manly Daily dated 19 September 2009)</p>	<p><i>Agreed. Necessary changes will be made to emphasise auditing and removing of unused dinghies before considering installation of dinghy storage racks</i></p>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

<p>4.</p>	<p>The proposed wharf is a terrible idea. Hopefully, this is not being considered seriously.</p> <p>I would also like to see a clear statement that neither of the boatsheds (commercial marinas/sleepways etc.) will be permitted to expand their operations or intensify their activities. Already too much of the public resource (i.e. North Harbour) is taken up by moored boats, marinas and boatsheds. It would be a complete scandal if there is not a significant reduction in these activities, as it is such a poor use of a priceless resource (i.e. we are using the harbour as the marine version of a cheap car park)</p> <p>It is vital to clean up the environment and to expand the marine park.</p> <p>Hopefully, the plan can propose a gradual/staged reduction in mooring numbers and can ensure that existing boatsheds etc remediate pollution and stop discharging into the harbour.</p>	<p><i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Fencing children’s playground. It’s very unsafe especially if more than one child to watch with high rock wall, busy road and water. I believe opposition to it before stemmed from a ridicules belief people would leave children unsupervised in order to use café. This is utter nonsense.</p> <p>I would consider failure to provide fencing leaves Council open to litigation if a child is seriously injured on road, water or rock face.</p>	<p><i>Fencing of children’s playground is an issue also raised before but overwhelming majority rejected as this will affect natural openness of the park</i></p>
<p>6.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Double (at least) the width of the existing pathway at the water’s edge at the NH reserve. 2. Continue the recently completed pathway on the eastern side of Condamine Street. It currently finishes halfway across the Reserve. So must continue to Lower Beach Street. 3. Enforce a 40k/h speed limit on Condamine Street from White Street to New Street East. Apart from safety to persons close to NHR. This section of Condamine is very heavily parked on both sides. 4. Requires additional tree planting on the NHR to give shade in few years time. 5. Improve access onto NHR for wheelchairs, prams etc. at the South-eastern corner of NHR. Improve the access stairs to the Bay at low tide 6. Complete the planned work on ‘Cathedral Rock’ near Forty Basket Beach as soon as possible.\ 	<p><i>Agreed. Already proposed</i></p> <p><i>Agreed, Necessary changes incorporated</i></p> <p><i>Agreed. Already proposed</i></p> <p><i>Agreed. Already proposed</i></p> <p><i>Agreed. Already proposed</i></p> <p><i>Not relevant to this Plan</i></p>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

		<i>North Harbour Reserve Landscape Masterplan is now in preparation considering many of these aspects</i>
7.	<p>1. Shade be provided for all picnic tables</p> <p>2. Widen Coastal path at North Harbour Reserve</p> <p>3. Have swimming pool style safety fence on the Condamine Street side of North Harbour Reserve with gates for Council vehicles</p> <p>4. Have North Harbour Reserve for dogs on leads only</p> <p>5. Have Brimbecom Park and Tania Park for dogs off leads</p> <p>6. Use an area of North Harbour Reserve – adjacent to Toilet block for a car park – leaving Condamine Street free of parked cars</p> <p>7. Repair zig zag path leading to the scenic walkway from Davis Marina – also the steps to the beach in the same area</p>	<p><i>Improvements considered</i></p> <p><i>Agreed. Already proposed</i></p> <p><i>Not being considered</i></p> <p><i>There will be no change to dog off-leash status</i></p> <p><i>Not being considered</i></p> <p><i>Not relevant to this Plan</i></p>
8.	<p>Tourist path between Nth Head Lookout and Manly Hospital along existing road. Path to be a minimum of 2.5 meters in width. Path to be stabilized compacted earth and gravel.</p> <p>Sewerage Plants: Build secondary/primary sewerage plants to relieve Nth Head Treatment Plant. At present, smell covers half Nth Head when screening removed</p>	<i>Not relevant to this Plan</i>
9.	<p>One of the areas of interest for many residents and visitors is the Fairlight Beach and pool area. At Little Manly Beach and pool we get many residents of the Fairlight and Balgowlah area, who visit for the day or a few hours, often with young children, but they often comment on the improvement to the grass area, access ramp and refurbished toilet facility. However, most favourable comment is in relation to the Cafe/kiosk facility.</p> <p>I have discussed this with the proprietor of the Little Manly Beach Cafe/kiosk and he has confirmed the interest from residents of Fairlight/Balgowlah area.</p> <p>At Little Manly we are very happy with the introduction of this reliable coffee and snack facility. A kiosk has existed for many years at the LM Beach, but reliable it wasn't, at least</p>	<i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>not until the present proprietor took over. What he has brought to the area is not just a convenience for local residents (and visitors) but an "on-site" supervisor for the area, who has maintained a watch on vandalism of the public facilities, especially the toilet block and bin areas, and a watch on the threat to wild life. There are numerous examples of this on-site management working to our advantage.</p> <p>Selling ice cream and coffee is a hard way to make a satisfactory living and we would like this proprietor to be successful, so that we have continuity of tenancy. When I mentioned the Fairlight beach area to Mr Sprott as an additional revenue source to improve his opportunity to be successful, he said that he has been considering a proposal to the Council because of the requests he gets from visiting residents. He has now put together a brief design proposal and has provided a copy to the Council Management that control lease arrangements.</p> <p>Under this proposal Mr Sprott is offering to pay for the development of this Council owned facility and pay for the upgrade of the public toilets. Given that the lower profile of the public toilets at Fairlight beach allows the addition of a second level kiosk, without damaging the view of nearby residents, it does seem to me that he has put together a good proposal.</p> <p>Now there will be those that feel threatened by any change and in my brief discussions with some of the Management Committee I encountered some reluctance to accept a development of this nature. I do think, however, that the majority of residents and visitors will regard this proposal as a major positive benefit</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p>Strongly support proposal for public access wharf. This could work well in conjunction with one of the marine businesses who could provide supervision/management.</p>	<p><i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>Recommendation for adoption in the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan:</p> <p>That the Manly Scenic Walkway be extended (to enable wheelchair/pram access) from rear No.93 Lauderdale Ave Fairlight along the foreshore via a boardwalk initially to North Harbour Reserve, and subsequently to Davis Marina.</p> <p><i>Comments.</i> At present the beautiful scenic foreshore walkway is wheelchair usable from Manly wharf to No.93 Lauderdale Ave, Fairlight where it is directed away from the foreshore</p>	<p><i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>onto a bike shared pathway beside busy Lauderdale Ave, continuing down the very narrow footpath of non-scenic concrete jungle King Ave. to a steep and lengthy stairway above North Harbour Reserve.</p> <p>Whereas, by continuing the Manly Scenic Walkway in a wheelchair friendly manner via a boardwalk to North Harbour Reserve along the foreshore would substantially enhance the walkway for use by all and provide a user friendly access to North Harbour Reserve. Extension of the boardwalk to Davis Marina would enable all users in both high and low tides to continue along this beautiful foreshore Walkway.</p>	
<p>12.</p>	<p>My recommendations are:</p> <p>A) A boardwalk around the foreshore at North Harbour Reserve.</p> <p>1) For safety. At present without a defined end to the grass area it is particularly dangerous for young children should they fall onto oyster- encrusted rocks.</p> <p>2) For aesthetics It would enhance the appearance between grassed area and the water.</p> <p>3) For practicality It would provide a path that does not impinge on or erode the grassed area.</p> <p>B) Extensions to that boardwalk along the foreshore to link with the present Scenic Walkway at Lauderdale Avenue, Fairlight at one end and Davis Marina at the other, to provide a true scenic panorama and a much needed benefit for wheelchair and pram users.</p> <p>Examples of excellent use of foreshore boardwalks are at:</p> <p>1) Forster 2) Merimbula 3) Narooma</p>	<p><i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>There is a community need for and I would like to see a kiosk at Fairlight pool</p>	<p><i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p>
<p>14.</p>	<p>I would like to see a dedicated water-bird roosting structure (s). There is a jetty at King Str. which one day may be demolished and is used by birds. The roost could be a small floating island in the middle of North harbour (some distance from the moorings) or a platform and roosting rails on the shoreline. An explanatory notice board could show the</p>	<p><i>Interesting proposal</i></p>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	different species of water birds – I think most people don't realise the many types of cormorants, divers etc.	
15.	<p>I am writing to request that a gutter crossing and small path be provided in Lower Beach Street connected to the top of the existing sloping ramp or path, which leads down into the park, to provide safe wheelchair and stroller access. This gutter crossing should be located for safety reasons, some distance from the corner of Condamine Street.</p> <p>From this car parking area, a footpath on the northern side of Lower Beach Street connected to the top of the existing sloping access ramp, would complete the job and allow the movement of people to be far more safe</p> <p>The danger existing now is that mothers park their cars in the Lower Beach Street car parking areas and they push their young children in strollers down Lower Beach Street, almost to the corner at Condamine Street to gain access to the park. This corner is blind corner caused by the toilet building and cars round this blind corner at speed, confronting mothers and their children in strollers.</p> <p>We look forward to Council's consideration resolution of this situation</p>	<i>Agreed. Necessary changes will be made</i>
16.	<p><u>Public Toilets:</u> The toilets at Nth Harbour Reserve require up grading, but I hope the same mistakes made at the Forty Baskets are not made, where the end result was a down grading of the facility (5 seats and a trough down to one seat) rather than upgrading. The Forty Baskets toilet issue is on going and needs to be included in the plan.</p> <p><u>Foreshore erosion and drainage:</u> The drainage and erosion around the eastern end of Gourley Avenue and on the beach wall on the eastern side of David Marina has not been addressed in the plan. It should be noted this issue has been brought to the attention of the Council on numerous times, dating back to 1999.</p> <p><u>Public Wharf:</u> This is long over due and should be a high priority. There are no public wharf in North Harbour to service the large numbers of craft on public moorings.</p> <p><u>Dinghy Racking:</u> This should not be included in the plan for the following reasons: It is pointless having racking in Nth Harbour Reserve due to the tidal effects in this end of bay. No one will use due to difficulty of launching and recovering craft through the mud flats at low tide</p>	<p><i>Agreed. Improvements proposed already</i></p> <p><i>Not relevant to this Plan</i></p> <p><i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p> <p><i>Agreed. Necessary changes will be made to emphasise auditing and removing of unused dinghies before considering installation of dinghy</i></p>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>It is pointless having racking on the western side of Davis Marina due to the lay of the land and erosion. Also the proposed racking is on the wrong end of the bay (western end) to serve people on public moorings, where the majority are on the eastern end of the bay</p> <p>The majority of the craft have been dumped, so they would not use the racking any way</p> <p>This all should be included in the day to day operation of the Council, not included in a strategic plan.</p>	<p><i>storage racks</i></p>
<p>17.</p>	<p>There are some good points and aims in the plan such as sea grass friendly moorings, stormwater improvement, bushland management and commercial fishing bans.</p> <p>But the area that worries me is the upgrading and enhancement of public facilities. Upgrading of existing facilities such as toilets, showers, swimming pools and boatsheds is fine. Expanding by adding cafes to boatsheds (Davis) and toilet blocks (Fairlight), wharves at North harbour reserve and more moorings can only do more damage to the environment in the long run. Our seagrass and marine life dependent on it are precious. Increased boat use in the area (and boat storage) cannot be considered an enhancement –it will be ultimately degrade the invertebrate colonies in North Harbour and the seagrass beyond it.</p> <p>Expanding by adding above mentioned facilities is irresponsible when climate change and its possible ramifications of sea level rise are considered.</p> <p>There are some wonderful underwater fish and corals beyond Fairlight beach that nobody sees nor knows about. What we have needs to be promoted (photos on interpretive signs such as at the gasworks.</p> <p>If more people (including boat owners – or especially boat owners!) know what was down there and what damage they do whenever they anchor – they might be more careful. Is there not an authority that can ensure careful anchoring techniques for example? We have already lost a lot of seagrass in the area. Let’s keep the rest.</p> <p>Yes, please do the place up by all means but let’s leave the nature we have left alone for all to enjoy.</p>	<p><i>Café and wharf are debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p> <p><i>Agreed. Necessary changes incorporated.</i></p>
<p>18.</p>	<p>It is important to maintain and enhance the natural beauty and pristine nature of the area.</p> <p>It is also important to recognise that this is a place where people live and raise families</p> <p>With these considerations in mind, some points which are</p>	

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>important to mums and dads and families like me are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please proceed with the expansion of the marine reserve to include all of North Harbour • Please ensure the protection and preservation of the ecosystem – all efforts to improve water quality are to be applauded; • Please don't damage the area by ill conceived public works or commercial developments – for example, (i) the public wharf and (ii) the proposed expansion of boatsheds in the area and (iii) the café at Fairlight Beach are absurd; • No expansion of car parking facilities – the adjoin streets are crowded enough as is, and unlike the magic pudding, they cannot be endlessly expanded to accommodate more and more cars without destroying the nearby streetscapes and tainting the harbourside reserve itself; • Lighting on the pathway needs to sympathetic to the aesthetis of the area – it should not be lit like Pitt Street • The ongoing and long term efforts of the scenic walkway committee and Council (Parks & Gardens Division) are to be applauded – for example, there has been a considerable reduction in weeds and introduced species over many years and the decision to keep bikes off the path has proven to be right things to do. • The needs of passive recreation (ie walkers, joggers, swimmers, kayakers, picnickers) need to be given priority. Unfortunately, I feel that we are often unheard. <p>It's a truly beautiful place so please keep it that way.</p>	<p><i>Agreed</i></p> <p><i>Agreed</i></p> <p><i>Café and wharf are debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p> <p><i>Agreed</i></p> <p><i>Agreed</i></p> <p><i>Agreed</i></p> <p><i>Agreed</i></p>
<p>19.</p>	<p>A. Suggestion – A proper wharf would be a benefit to the area. This wharf could be built where the original swimming enclosure was built. The steps are still there – (see recent Manly Daily feature on the original pool. To help with the finances, NSW Maritime will share the cost on a 50-50 basis. This wharf would service the marine users 24/7. The two boatsheds have restricted hours and restricted to people using their moorings or Marina (Davis). To gain more financial assistance, a disability access would be an advantage.</p> <p>B. The single toot at 40 Baskets just completed should be moved to an area that has less traffic flow passing by. A brick toilet block should be built again with 4 toots and a double urinal in the Mens and 6 Toots in the Ladies. Incorporate the change room and showers into the brick building. Really it is disgraceful that only one Toot was placed in this position with large groups of walkers passing by, tourists and locals. Any staff, GM or Councillors must look into the feature when building ammenities</p>	<p><i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p> <p><i>Not relevant to this Plan</i></p>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>C. Dinghy racks in the North Harbour Reserve. This area is now a mud flat. Previously it was deep area with a boat shed nearby on Condamine Street. The built wall has given great parkland but has altered the marine area. Dinghy racks in the northern corner with dredged area to the wall for access.</p>	<i>Agreed</i>
20.	<p>1) Better lighting on Scenic Walkway, please.</p> <p>2) Better signage regarding dogs in penguin zone, please</p> <p>3) More dog faeces waste bins on Manly Scenic Walkway, please</p>	<i>All agreed. Already proposed in the Plan</i>
21.	I agree with and support the issues agreed on by the Fairlight Precinct meeting on 12 November 2009	
22.	Agree with Fairlight Precinct submission, excluding any sculpture on the scenic walkway. Beautiful just as it is and does not need any manmade artwork to improve on it.	
23.	<p>The great charm of the area is that it is still relatively quiet, not grossly overdeveloped. The marine reserve idea is brilliant. I also like some of the proposed works (such as the path to connect King Av. To North Harbour Reserve for prams/wheelchair)</p> <p>The suggestion of a public wharf is absurd and is the very type of development that must be prevented. Too much of the foreshore is already given away to the boating industry. Too much of North Harbour is given away as a parking lot for boats</p> <p>Key priorities for me are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pollution reduction - Improvement of water quality - Restrictions on commercial development [i.e no expansion or intensification of current commercial uses] - Improvement of landscaping 	<i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i>

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

<p>24.</p>	<p>North Harbour Precinct Community Forum</p> <p>North Harbour and Balgowlah Precinct Community Forum commends Manly Council for the development of the NH Coastal Management Plan. The Plan provides a comprehensive map for the ongoing maintenance and requirements for this area.</p> <p>The Precinct Community Forum (PCF) is submitting its feedback to the Plan and the specific recommendations and inputs are outlined below as motions from the PCF.</p> <p>No big picture plan historically very important precinct one of first ten villages laid out by Mitchell surveyor general 1828 Need top preserve historic aspects</p> <p>AH4.1 and AH4.2. Water quality suitable for natural habitat conservation. Pages 8 and 39.</p> <p>The Precinct supports the management options to investigate SQUIDS and screens as a High priority and urges Council to investigate this within a 2 year timeframe, rather than the 3-4 years as proposed. The PCF also urges Council to include the storm water drain coming from Wellings Reserve being funnelled onto the lower end of Goulay Ave creating erosion on the seawall between Davis Marina and NH sailing Club. Could Council investigate whether the squids could be put on the western side of Condamine St</p> <p><i>SQUIDS to be High priority & 2 year timeframe. Also stormwater Drain from Wellings Reserve and review of drain on Western side of Condamine St.</i></p> <p>PF1.1 Enhance general amenities for public use. Page 9 & 55</p> <p>The Precinct supports the review of toilets, telephone booths and lights and the consultation with the PCF. The PCF can provide useful feedback and information and welcomes the opportunity to be involved. Forty Baskets still requires the addition of an extra toilet to cope with demand.</p> <p><i>Supports review of Toilets, telephone & lights with Precinct</i></p> <p>PF1.2. Traffic management around public reserves and beaches. Pages 9 & 55.</p> <p>2 hour parking residential - Precinct rejects 2 hr parking around public reserves and beaches.</p> <p>Lower speed limit in Condamine Street: Precinct supports the lowering of the speed limit around NH reserve and urges council to work with the RTA to reduce the speed of cars.</p> <p><i>PRECINCT Rejects 2 hour residential Parking around public reserves & Beaches Lower speed limit Around NHR</i></p>	<p><i>Agreed. Changed time-frame accepted. In fact, Council is about to initiate design of a GPT at North Harbour</i></p>
-------------------	---	---

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>PF1.5. Feasibility of constructing public wharf at North Harbour. Pages 9 and 57.</p> <p>The Precinct supports the investigation of options for a public wharf but only on the condition that the wider community input is sought and taken into account in making any recommendations. Precinct agrees there is a need for a public wharf in the NH aquatic reserve area and other sites need to be investigated, not just Nth Harbour.</p> <p><i>Precinct supports investigation of public wharf</i></p> <p>PF2.1. Paved footpath both sides of Condamine Street. Pages 9 and 57.</p> <p>Needs clarification about which sections. If it is the section along the edge of the park already under construction, was the community consulted? <i>Paved footpath already in on Eastern side of Condamine St</i></p> <p>PF2.2. Audit disability access of parks and bays in study area. Pages 9 and 58.</p> <p>The Precinct supports Council conducting an audit for disability access and wants Council to consult with the community for ideas before any plans are finalised. <i>Conduct audit & consult with Precinct as to where access is to be placed.</i></p> <p>PF3.1. Install adequate dog faeces bins, water bowl and bag dispensers. Pages 9 and 58</p> <p>The Precinct supports Council's proposed actions especially the option for bio-degradable bags and regular ranger patrols. Again, the PCF requests community consultation prior to the installation of faeces bins, water bowls and bag dispensers.</p> <p><i>Consult before installation</i></p> <p>NR2.1 Prepare landscape Masterplan for North Harbour Reserve in consultation with precincts and community. Pages 10 and 62.</p> <p>The PRECINCT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the Precinct and community consultation for the development of the Masterplan ▪ Supports the following for the Masterplan: the development of the master plan in close consultation with the precinct and the community, stressing the 	<p><i>change</i></p> <p><i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p> <p><i>Agreed</i></p>
--	---	--

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>need to maintain NH reserve in its current open format with minimal infrastructure</p> <p><i>Supports development of Masterplan. Stress need to maintain NHR in current open format and minimal infrastructure.</i></p> <p>NR3.1 Assess recycling of stormwater to irrigate North Harbour Reserve. Pages 10 and 63.</p> <p>The PCF supports Council's proposed actions</p> <p><i>Supports recycling of stormwater.</i></p> <p>NR4.1 Widen and upgrade paths to and within North Harbour Reserve. Pages 10 and 64.</p> <p>The Precinct supports the assessment of the paths, but only supports any changes and infrastructures that have been considered through community consultation and that have community support.</p> <p><i>The PCF strongly objects to paths within the park. PRECINCT strongly objects to footpaths within the park . Along foreshore only.</i></p> <p>NR4.2 Locate and investigate suitability of graded wheel chair access. Pages 10& 64.</p> <p>The PCF supports the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upgrading of access on the southern side North Harbour Reserve and not on the southern side thru Lower Beach St <p>The PCF does not support and objects to constructing access way from the northern side of the reserve as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This would cause major damage to and loss of Burton's Bush ▪ Any access from King Avenue is narrow, steep and not suitable ▪ The use of wide and long paths would attract skateboards, bikes etc and be a potential hazard to users and the neighbourhood. <p><i>Supports upgrading of access on southern side from Lower Beach St. Does not support access way from King Ave</i></p> <p>NR4.3 Investigate the provision of improved parking at North Harbour Reserve. Pages 10 and 65.</p> <p>The area shown is the western side of Condamine Street. <i>The PCF supports the landscape proposal but does not support metered parking</i></p>	<p><i>To be considered as part of the Landscape Masterplan</i></p>
--	---	--

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<i>Precinct supports landscape proposal but no metered parking. Ugly and detracts from leisurely aspect of park. Creates no more parking only pressure for coins and for users of the park.</i>	<i>Agreed, Necessary changes made</i>																																													
25.	<p>Fairlight Precinct Forum</p> <p>1. Key Issues (excluding penguins & some amenity issues discussed separately) Key issues from a facilitated discussion and the extent of concurrence by members present were as follows (numbering does not reflect any particular level of importance).</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Issue</th> <th>Agreed</th> <th>Identified in Draft Plan</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Improve lighting on Scenic Walkway – Fairlight to Manly and further west</td> <td>Unanimous</td> <td>Should be in PF 1.1</td> <td><i>Noted</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Install SCUBA facilities at Fairlight – need careful positioning, suitable salt-tolerant grass surrounds and possibly an additional beach shower</td> <td>Unanimous</td> <td>PF 1.4</td> <td><i>Noted</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Possible public jetty at North Harbour (discussed in context of possible location at Treharne’s Manly Boatshed)</td> <td>Concerns about access & loss of grassed area, parking, insurances</td> <td>PF 1.5</td> <td><i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Pram, wheelchair & limited mobility access required to North Harbour Reserve from King Ave</td> <td>Unanimous</td> <td>NR4.1 and NR 4.2</td> <td><i>Noted. Not supported by North Harbour Precinct</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>High tide access from North Harbour Reserve to mudflats area – condition of stairs</td> <td>Unanimous</td> <td></td> <td><i>Noted</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>Width of pathway across North Harbour Reserve & erosion of sides</td> <td>Unanimous</td> <td>NR 4.1</td> <td><i>Noted</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>Stone / rock wall below the pathway needs restoration</td> <td>Unanimous</td> <td>HR 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 and 4.1</td> <td><i>Noted. Design initiated</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>Stormwater drain in northern corner of North Harbour – need for upstream GPT or other</td> <td>Some concerns about ability to service</td> <td>AH 4.1</td> <td><i>Noted. Design to be initiated soon</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Issue	Agreed	Identified in Draft Plan		1	Improve lighting on Scenic Walkway – Fairlight to Manly and further west	Unanimous	Should be in PF 1.1	<i>Noted</i>	2	Install SCUBA facilities at Fairlight – need careful positioning, suitable salt-tolerant grass surrounds and possibly an additional beach shower	Unanimous	PF 1.4	<i>Noted</i>	3	Possible public jetty at North Harbour (discussed in context of possible location at Treharne’s Manly Boatshed)	Concerns about access & loss of grassed area, parking, insurances	PF 1.5	<i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i>	4	Pram, wheelchair & limited mobility access required to North Harbour Reserve from King Ave	Unanimous	NR4.1 and NR 4.2	<i>Noted. Not supported by North Harbour Precinct</i>	5	High tide access from North Harbour Reserve to mudflats area – condition of stairs	Unanimous		<i>Noted</i>	6	Width of pathway across North Harbour Reserve & erosion of sides	Unanimous	NR 4.1	<i>Noted</i>	7	Stone / rock wall below the pathway needs restoration	Unanimous	HR 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 and 4.1	<i>Noted. Design initiated</i>	8	Stormwater drain in northern corner of North Harbour – need for upstream GPT or other	Some concerns about ability to service	AH 4.1	<i>Noted. Design to be initiated soon</i>	
	Issue	Agreed	Identified in Draft Plan																																												
1	Improve lighting on Scenic Walkway – Fairlight to Manly and further west	Unanimous	Should be in PF 1.1	<i>Noted</i>																																											
2	Install SCUBA facilities at Fairlight – need careful positioning, suitable salt-tolerant grass surrounds and possibly an additional beach shower	Unanimous	PF 1.4	<i>Noted</i>																																											
3	Possible public jetty at North Harbour (discussed in context of possible location at Treharne’s Manly Boatshed)	Concerns about access & loss of grassed area, parking, insurances	PF 1.5	<i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i>																																											
4	Pram, wheelchair & limited mobility access required to North Harbour Reserve from King Ave	Unanimous	NR4.1 and NR 4.2	<i>Noted. Not supported by North Harbour Precinct</i>																																											
5	High tide access from North Harbour Reserve to mudflats area – condition of stairs	Unanimous		<i>Noted</i>																																											
6	Width of pathway across North Harbour Reserve & erosion of sides	Unanimous	NR 4.1	<i>Noted</i>																																											
7	Stone / rock wall below the pathway needs restoration	Unanimous	HR 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 and 4.1	<i>Noted. Design initiated</i>																																											
8	Stormwater drain in northern corner of North Harbour – need for upstream GPT or other	Some concerns about ability to service	AH 4.1	<i>Noted. Design to be initiated soon</i>																																											

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

		litter/pollution control	GPTs so as not to <i>increase</i> pollution levels		
9		Picnic tables at southern end of North Harbour Reserve need synthetic 'grass' or other solution to serious erosion. Possibly also install additional tables and seats to reduce concentration of use.	Unanimous	Should be in PF 1.1	<i>Noted</i>
10		Erosion of grassed area below Arlington Drive) Stormwater drain in above area White PVC pipe in above area	Unanimous Unanimous Unanimous	Mentioned in HR 2.1	<i>Noted</i>
11		Scenic walkway at Lauderdale Ave – possibility of a boardwalk across part of the harbour – avoiding King Ave & bottom of Boyle St	Some neighbour, environmental & cost concerns		<i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i>
12		Vehicle parking on the Reserve / Scenic Walkway west of Bolingbroke Ave – we understand this is to cease soon – when? – should be spelt out in plan	Some concerns about local on-street parking impacts		<i>Traffic Section of Council informed</i>
13		Clean up abandoned kayaks, dinghies etc between David Marina and North Harbour Reserve on south of North Harbour, and also in vicinity of Treharnes' boatshed	Unanimous	PF 1.3	<i>Agreed</i>
14		Install dinghy & kayak racks (as at Forty Baskets) with Harbour access within the study area – NOT at Fairlight Beach – on south side of North Harbour preferred	Unanimous	PF 1.3	<i>Agreed</i>
15		Maintain cap on number of moorings in North Harbour AND cap the size/density of vessels moored (avoid becoming a marine parking lot)	Unanimous	To Waterways / NSW Maritime	<i>Agreed</i>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

<p>X</p>	<p>Parking near Fairlight Beach – already stressed, could become worse with kiosk and / or public wharf and / or cars off Walkway - see Notes</p>		<p>Should be in PF 1.2</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Notes referring to numbered items above:</p> <p>1. PF 1.1 refers to enhancing general amenities “at convenient locations”. This should be clarified by deleting those 3 words – & noting that lighting right along the Scenic Walkway is a public amenity in need of enhancement. The section Bolingbroke to Lauderdale has been promised as a Precinct project for 2009-10. Please also note for the audit of existing facilities that toilet / shower facilities at Fairlight Beach are poor.</p> <p>4 & 11 are both related to need for pram, wheelchair & limited mobility access. Plan appears to dismiss access from King Ave (<i>"Also footpath along King St is very narrow and most likely not suitable for wheel chair access."</i>). <i>We do not agree with this statement (& anyway there are no problems for prams). We believe there needs to be an accessible route from Manly to NHR, not just solutions catering to car drivers or Balgowlah residents. (Change all references to King St to King Ave.)</i></p> <p><i>5. Appears not to be mentioned in Plan – should be – this is a safety hazard.</i></p> <p><i>9. Please note these comments for PF 1.1 audit of facilities.</i></p> <p><i>12. Self explanatory – plan should say what the situation is.</i></p> <p><i>X. Parking problems – Bolingbroke & Fairlight Crescent – discussed later in meeting.</i></p> <p><i>The first action point under PF 1.2 is</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ENFORCEMENT OF 2-HOUR PARKING IN RESIDENTIAL AREA <p><i>THIS APPEARS TO REFER ONLY TO CONDAMINE ST. IT SHOULD BE MADE VERY CLEAR THAT THIS ALSO APPLIES TO BOLINGBROKE PARADE & FAIRLIGHT CRESCENT – OUR PRECINCT HAS COMPLAINED MANY TIMES ABOUT LACK OF ENFORCEMENT.</i></p> <p>2. Possibility of kiosk on Fairlight Beach</p> <p>Extensively discussed – many arguments for & against.</p> <p>Resolved to commence a survey.</p> <p>Although not specifically voted on at meeting, there appears to be sufficient support for an item in the PF area such as “Consider the possibility of a kiosk on Fairlight Beach”</p>				
				<p><i>This has been identified as one fo the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i></p>

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>3. Little Penguins at Federation Point</p> <p>Current situation, issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 chicks already; activity in 3 nests suggests more to come. • Off duty penguin warden recently attacked by owner of unleashed large dog – police involved • Penguins come up to path – there are often unleashed dogs – signage inadequate – many people just don't see it • Not enough volunteers to provide wardens at Federation Point – people reluctant anyway, given two attacks now on wardens here & can be pretty lonely place. • Official SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) planning map doesn't show penguin habitat at Federation Point & the Wharf • Penguins here don't have "critical habitat" protection like those at Little Manly. <p>Resolved to recommend to Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much bigger, penguin specific signage <u>painted on the path</u> at several points (eg at Federation Point & at start of WPA) – perhaps a penguin with a speech bubble (this idea was tested on 15/11 at a Precinct information day& met with enthusiastic approval). • It press Government to update its maps to show penguin habitat at Federation Point & the Wharf & to grant "critical habitat" protection. <p>So, we believe the action points under AH 2.2 should be more along the lines of (2nd & 3rd updated & 2 new ones added)</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Support continuation of the WPA.</i> • <i>Find ways to encourage Penguin Wardens to patrol the area – eg guaranteed instant response hotline.</i> • <i>Radically improve educational/interpretive signage – be realistic, there are no wardens at present & at least 50% of dogs remain off leash as they enter zone from west & are released from leash at Federation Point on return.</i> • <i>Improve fencing to restrict companion animal interactions with Little Penguins</i> • <i>Investigate existence of Little Penguins near Treharne's Manly Boatshed</i> • <i>Seek to get "Little Penguin Critical Habitat map" as attached to SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 updated to show Wharf & Federation Point as known habitat areas</i> • <i>Try (again) to obtain critical habitat status for these penguins</i> 	<p><i>Agreed. Necessary changes incorporated.</i></p>
--	--	---

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>6. Penguins & Manly Bathers Pavilion – false statement in Plan to be corrected</p> <p>7. The Plan contains the following statement</p> <p>“Recent renovations and changes in use of the Bather’s Pavilion, as has been assessed, will not pose threats to wildlife and habitats in the area.”</p> <p>This is totally inconsistent with Council’s Environmental Planner’s comments in the DAU submission to MIAP, eg</p> <p>Environmental Planners Comments <i>“As a result the development, while approved under DA279/04, is not (considered to be) sympathetic to the Little Penguin breeding area that exists immediately adjacent (ie: within a few metres) of the MBP. Furthermore there were no appropriate conditions of consent included to minimise impacts to the Little Penguins of the development or operation of the approved facility.”</i></p> <p><i>“Based on an assessment of the information provided the Natural Resources Branch is not satisfied that the proposal can be carried out without impacting on the individual Little Penguins breeding in the immediate locality. However, given that approval has already been issued under DA279/04 there is limited scope for restricting or changing the approved development.”</i></p> <p>The statement should therefore be amended to read:</p> <p>“Recent renovations and changes in use of the Bather’s Pavilion, as has been assessed, <u>will pose significant threats</u> to wildlife and habitat in the area.”</p> <p>7. Miscellaneous other matters raised 15 November</p> <p>Fairlight Precinct held an information day on 15 November. Additional matters raised by participants included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycling on Walkway still common – need for enhanced prevention / signage • Need to clarify if children under 12 (if accompanied by adult) are permitted to cycle on Walkway • Commonwealth Parade north side badly potholed in places – need for repairs – this forces some pedestrians to south side or onto Walkway who would prefer to be on Commonwealth Parade north side & avoid all risk of cyclists. • Need for a phone number on signage that the public may ring if they discover injured or at risk penguin (lady reported finding chick near path on way to work & inability to locate someone to rescue urgently). • A reason advanced at Precinct meeting for a public wharf was a possible medical emergency. Precinct should 	<p><i>Necessary amendments made</i></p> <p><i>All noted</i></p>
--	--	---

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>clarify whether Hugo's fixed structures at Manly Wharf now make ambulance access impossible. If not, this is the logical place for the rare medical emergency.</p>	
<p>26.</p>	<p>EcoDivers</p> <p>The following submission outlines our concerns and highlights some of the issues that are more apparent to those of us that spend a lot of time near in and under the water. It also reflects a growing community interest, knowledge of and respect for the natural environment and the uniqueness of Manly's coastal and foreshore areas and their flora and fauna.</p> <p>Comments against each of the six key headings ...</p> <p>Aquatic/intertidal habitat conservation & management,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Pursue a submitted proposal to extend the boundary of North Harbour Aquatic Reserve" – Aquatic Reserve – should mean just that .. no take area .. passive recreation only ... we are lucky enough to have key habitats and a few protected species on our doorstep, the bigger the area the better with clear boundaries and enforcement of restrictions. • "Assist DECCW with preparation and implementation of North Harbour Aquatic Reserve Management Plan" – Assist and encourage DECCW to implement and publicize management plan and progressively review any plan now every 3 years as factors like overfishing and climate change has accelerated the impacts on fragile and not so fragile marine habitats. • "Pursue & process to declare inter-tidal areas of North Harbour as Intertidal Protected Area' under the Fisheries Management Act". – A critical conservation action that must be made to help save what remains along our foreshores, however it is only effective if policed and enforced with prosecutions. The critical long term conservation of the local marine habitat outweighs any vocal self indulgent destructive individuals or groups [ie fishing] • Continue managing Wildlife Protected Area at Federation Point Any established area requires management and as we have found animals don't see red lines on maps, this area should be expanded in line with intertidal zone protection and fishing bans. • Assess marine biodiversity of North Harbour including Aquatic Reserve - This is a large undertaking, from our aspect, after 100s of dives all through the area throughout the year and in all conditions, the diversity of marine life that manages to survive 	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted. Suggested review incorporated</i></p> <p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p>

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>despite our impact is amazing. Given more protection from fishing and pollution the area has the potential to be not just a massive breeding area for 1000s of species but a Marine wonderland!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Locate soldier crab colony at the far west end of North Harbour and undertake protection measures” – yes ..cute little fellas and one of the few places left, when once these critters used to be everywhere. • “Continue to encourage I&I NSW to support conservation of sea grass and kelp beds” – essential part of the entire marine habitat, the protection of sea grass being not only legislated but essential for water quality and breeding and diversity. Manly can play a lead role as it has what’s left of the sea grass as well as the ability to put significant actions in place to protect sub 10 metre habitats. • “Work with NSW Maritime and I&I NSW to introduce sea grass friendly Moorings” – not only do private vessels in the manly cove area need these moorings, those in little manly cove and North Harbour as well any conventional swing mooring in sub 10m depth is damaging existing sea grass or preventing sea grass from re-establishing. <p>We know now just how important sea grass is and we have commenced an education project “save your bottom” to help emphasize and highlight the importance and vulnerability of this much abused marine habitat. The placement of public moorings in key areas like Manly Cove behind the pool where the sea grass is “ploughed” on a regular basis by boat visitors to manly, especially over summer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Investigate feasibility of Storm water Quality Improvement Devices (SQIDs) on major storm water outlets that discharge into North Harbour to ensure healthy aquatic habitat”. – runoff is a huge problem and accounts for a large percentage of debris entering the water especially plastics. In our increasingly unpredictable climate where huge storms follow weeks or months of drought ... the catchment is saturated with rubbish and oils / heavy metals / other pollutants , the big storm then acts to flush it all into the harbour or ocean in a very short timeframe having devastating effects and unseen and unrecorded impacts on marine life. <p>The introduction of a three level outfall filtering system tied to a dedicated team reacting to weather / climate not 9 to 5 Monday to Friday would significantly reduce the physical pollution from runoff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Place screens on minor storm water outfalls to improve water quality and aquatic health” – start with screens and work back to drains, which can also have primary screening. <p>Bush land/terrestrial habitat conservation & management,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of the terrestrial habitat to the coastal and marine environment has been working well for millions of years .. its only recently that we have had problems. Impacts of development, introduced species 	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p>
--	--	---

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>and animals, fishing have some very noticeable effects but often we only take notice of the obvious short term things and find out about the other larger, longer term impacts when it's too late.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The restoration of as much coastal environment to pre white man condition where possible is a start. The long term removal of pest plant species along the north harbour coastline and the pull back of manmade structures indiscriminate fishing / collecting is a start. <p>Upgrading of Public Facilities,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to attract and provide safe and adequate facilities for the public locals and visitors alike. There is a huge cost in willful and malicious damage by persons both local and from out of area that has seen the design and function of these facilities change in line with "survival" more than comfort. The change in attitude / aspect where security / policing is concentrated in "high" times and every morning a sweep of facilities is undertaken to ensure safety and operation as well as evidence gathering for prosecution, and when caught imposition of large fines and public humiliation is mandatory, this money then goes towards restoration. Fines for littering and illegal parking could also be channeled to wards public facilities and maintenance. <p>North Harbour Reserve Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In line with the above point, "ownership" of local parks and facilities by the community adds to the security and maintenance of the area. This is one example of a family park / area that is used mostly by locals due to its off the beaten path position, improvements in facilities and maintenance of this area would be well supported by the manly community which are the people that count the most when it comes to results and actions. <p>Hazards & climate change,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing and a global issue, Manly can be a leader in the restoration, protection and adaption of natural and manmade areas to the inevitable increases in water levels and temperature. Action now is critical.. talk has been going on for 30 years!. <p>Heritage conservation & management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas and places of genuine historical significance are a legacy that is beyond short term development, manly has lost some amazing buildings. We are obliged to look after our heritage and that of the local original inhabitants as we are just short term tenants. <p>Summary Eco Divers as a organization are made up of individuals that</p>	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p>
--	--	---

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	stationary boats and canoes etc.	<i>preparation of the proposed North Harbour Aquatic Reserve Management Plan</i>
AH 2.4	We believe the soldier crabs which once inhabited the mud flats at the end of the North Harbour have gone.	<i>Information noted</i>
AH 3.2	We will be following the success or otherwise of the new sea grass friendly mooring system with interest. It should be noted that an independent report commissioned by Davis Marina found that all of our mooring are located outside seagrass prone areas. This report was included in our recent development application.	<i>Information noted</i>
AH 4	Davis Marina with its approved DA for refurbishment will contribute to improved water quality.	<i>Information noted</i>
AH 4.1	SQUIDS will make a substantial improvement to water quality.	
AH4.2	Bushland/Terrestrial Management Options are supported.	
AH4.3	Public Facilities	
PF 1.2	2P parking is not appropriate for North Harbour. Picnickers, walkers and sailors all stay for longer.	<i>Information communicated to Traffic section of Council</i>
PF 1.3	Many of the dinghies stored near Davis Marina are disowned. Before installing racks we suggest that all abandoned and unseaworthy craft are removed. When that has been done, see if the perceived problem still exists. A few dinghies on the waterfront are acceptable. If the problem is significant then racking maybe required.	<i>Agreed. Necessary changes will be made to emphasise auditing and removing of unused dinghies before considering installation of dinghy storage racks</i>
PF 1.5	We believe there should be a public wharf in North Harbour. There are two types of users:- 1) Boaters visiting Manly who wish to shop, eat and drink and buy supplies, and 2) locals who have a boat moored in North Harbour and wish to pick up and set down guests. Type 1) - would wish to be as near Manly Wharf as possible.	<i>This has been identified as one of the debatable issues. Decision to be based on discussion at the HFCMC</i>

ATTACHMENT 3

**Planning And Strategy Division Report No. 6 - Adoption of the North Harbour
Coastline Management Plan
Submissions from Public Exhibition**

	<p>We believe that it was Councils original intention to incorporate a public wharf in the redevelopment of Manly Wharf.</p> <p>Type 2) – their requirements are not so site specific but any public wharf should be accessible to an Ambulance.</p> <p>General Comment</p> <p>1) The car park in Gourlay Avenue is unique and has a wonderful ambience and history. It functions well and requires no significant change. The log retaining walls on the uphill side need repair as does the northern edge of the bitumen. The gutter and drainage pipes require routine cleaning. Apart from these small matters Davis Marina believes the car parking is should be left as it is at present.</p> <p>2) We have received comments that the public toilets at Forty Baskets beach require duplicating. It seems that with the number of people on the Sydney Harbour walk and the day trippers to the beach and pool additional toilet facilities are required.</p>	<p><i>Not relevant to this Plan</i></p> <p><i>Not relevant to this Plan</i></p>