

**Report to General Manager**Attachment: Public Exhibition Feedback Matrix

SUBJECT: Coal Loader Proposed Parkland, Waverton – Public Exhibition Feedback**AUTHOR:** David Banbury, Landscape Architect, 5 December 2006**SUMMARY:**

At the meeting of 13/06/06 Council resolved to place the concept designs for the Coal Loader / Caltex Site on public exhibition. The exhibition material was subsequently advertised widely for a period of 60 days and many submissions were received. This report details the submissions and makes recommendation with regards to the feedback submitted.

Note: A separate report has been tabled for consideration at this meeting regarding proposals for the SES relocation to the former powerhouse building in the adaptive reuse precinct.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the exhibited Concept Designs for Coal Loader, subject to the amendments as detailed in the recommendations in the attachment to this report, be adopted for the purpose of preparing Detail Designs and lodgement of a Development Application for the proposed parkland at the Coal Loader Site.

Signed _____

Endorsed by _____
Director Open Space & Environmental Services

DETAIL

Background

In 2005 a consultancy team lead by Hassell Pty Ltd was engaged to prepare detailed designs and construction documentation for the proposed new parkland at the former Coal Loader site in Waverton. The consultancy team covers a range of professional disciplines relevant to the redevelopment of the site, including expertise in the areas of landscape architecture, architecture, engineering (civil, structural, geo-technical, electrical, environmental), heritage, archaeological, property, cost planning, lighting, graphic design, public art, signage and interpretation.

The process of realising the parkland development includes the following stages:

- Project initiation and data collection
- Concept / Design development
- Detail design
- Development application
- Documentation of tenders for construction
- Tender administration
- Contract administration

Consultation to date has included a number of meetings with Council officers, community and stakeholder groups, a public workshop and open day, presentations to the Waverton Peninsula Ex-industrial Sites Steering Committee and Councillor briefings.

Concept drawings and an associated report were prepared and subsequently placed on public exhibition (refer report to Council 13/06/06) to enable community / stakeholder feedback on the designs.

Public Exhibition

As outlined in the consultation strategy adopted by Council on 13/06/06, the drawings and report were placed on exhibition for a period of 2 months, commencing 22/06/2006. The exhibition material was displayed in the following locations:

- Council Customer Service Centre
- Stanton Library
- North Sydney Council Website

Public notices were placed in the Mosman Daily (22/06/06, 06/07/06, 20/07/06, 27/07/06, 03/08/06 & 17/08/06) Sydney Morning Herald (27/06/06, 15/07/06, 18/07/06, 22/07/06, 05/08/06, & 19/08/06) and on Council's website advising of the exhibition. Notices advising of the exhibition were sent to:

- All Precincts
 - The Coal Loader Sustainability Centre Community Design Group
 - The Waverton Peninsula Ex-industrial Sites Steering Committee
 - The Waverton Peninsula Ex-industrial Sites Stakeholder Reference Group, including:
-

- NSW Department of Planning
- NSW Department of Commerce
- Maritime NSW
- Sydney Harbour and Foreshores Committee
- National Trust of Australia (NSW)
- NSW Environment Protection Authority
- NSW Department of Lands
- NSW Heritage Office
- Ministry for the Arts
- HMAS Waterhen
- Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council

Further to Notice of Motion 29/06 (as adopted by Council 05/06/06) a meeting was held on 25 July 2006 for all local sporting / recreational groups (including groups that were consulted in relation to the North Sydney Council Recreation Needs Study) and representatives of local schools to discuss plans for the coal loader platform and their suitability for active and passive recreational use. Approximately 11 representatives from various organisations attended this meeting.

A public meeting was also held on 29 July 2006 (10:00am – 12:00 noon at the Mollie Dive Function Centre) to allow the broader community an opportunity to discuss the concept designs. Over 80 people attended the meeting from a range of stakeholder groups.

Submissions Received

A total of 208 submissions were received during the exhibition period, not including the bound petition document lodged by the SES in support of their relocation to the site, which included 2,924 signatures (157 Waverton residents, 1525 North Sydney other, 1407 outside North Sydney). The issues raised in the 208 submissions are detailed in the Attachment to this report, together with associated recommendations for matter raised. The majority of the submissions were in relation to the merits or otherwise of the mooted relocation of the SES to the site, which reflects the contentious nature of this proposal.

A summary of the submissions in respect of those for and against the SES on the site is shown below. Of the 207 submissions received, 128 were in the form of signed tear-off slips from a pro-forma distributed by SES representatives. These are itemised separately.

	Overall Position	No.	Notes
A.	Support SES - no preferred option stated	29	(Includes 17 emails with matching text)
B.	Support SES – Option D (ie two storey option)	4	
C.	Support SES – Option D but not exclusive use of mess hall	1	
D.	Support SES – if doesn't involve tree /bushland removal	1	

E.	Subtotal support SES (not including proformas - see below)	<u>35</u>	
F.	Against SES – no preference stated on the other options for this area	15	
G.	Against SES & no further built structures (ie keep to master plan scheme for north-east corner which keeps this area visually open to link with the adjacent bushland / parkland)	18	Includes Waverton Precinct, Sydney Harbour Foreshore Committee
H.	Against SES - Support nursery in north-east corner	2	
I.	Support nursery – no preference re location options (ie upper or lower terrace) – SES not mentioned	4	
J.	Support nursery – lower terrace – SES not mentioned	1	
K.	Support nursery in north east corner + if SES cannot be located offsite then more design options needed	1	
L.	Subtotal against SES (including I,J,K assumed)	<u>41</u>	
M.	Other (general comments)	4	
N.	Subtotal of submissions rec'd not including faxed SES proformas (see below)	<u>80</u>	
O.	Faxed SES proforma (in favour of SES – no preferred option stated)	128	
P.	Total including faxed SES proforma	<u>208</u>	

A number of other submissions provided very comprehensive feedback on a broad range of issues. Generally these submissions were very supportive of the overall concepts put forward, but raised concerns where the concepts departed from the original master plan.

Discussion

Aside from the SES proposal, which as noted above was controversial, the majority of comments were very supportive of the overall plan and felt that the concepts proposed were in keeping with the principles espoused in the Waverton Peninsula Master Plan. However as noted above a number of concerns were raised where the concepts varied from the original master plan. In particular the proposal to retain / rebuild part of the former Caltex Site office

in the north east corner of the site was not supported as the master plan proposed that this building be demolished and be replaced with extended bushland.

Other concerns raised included that of parking on site versus offsite; the need to improve pedestrian access to the site in general (particularly from the north); the need to formalise / provide increased opportunity for on-street parking adjacent to the site; and the need to provide improved traffic safety in the streets surrounding the parkland.

There was support for the proposed community nursery and allotment gardens, though the preference was generally that the nursery and associated infrastructure (eg potting table, shade house) be located on the lower terrace in the car-park area. As parking on the upper terrace was also rejected, there will be a need during the detail design stage to work out an effective layout in this area that can provide for the proposed nursery and associated infrastructure, whilst maintaining the minimum number of required parking spaces.

The approach to the treatment of the platform was strongly supported, particularly the idea of removing part of the western hob wall to improve views to the harbour. However the issue of shade on the platform was raised as one that needed more detailed consideration. Preference was expressed that in regards to active recreational activities, the platform be used only on a casual / informal basis and that no mesh fences be permitted. Some concerns were also expressed regarding the impacts of the proposed steel ramp

The proposed incorporation of sustainability principles throughout the site redevelopment, including the proposed Sustainability Centre, was also strongly supported.

Some submissions were concerned about the viability of the café, whilst others saw it as an important component of the site that would attract people into the site and contribute to the ambience of the street.

The importance of maintaining links with the adjacent maritime assets was raised in a number of submissions, including the need to ensure the design of the proposed shared access way to the wharf was sympathetic to the parkland.

Concerns were raised by NSW Maritime that the parkland proposals fail to take an integrated approach to the adjacent maritime activities, including access to the wharf. However the need for the parkland to better interface with the harbour and associated maritime infrastructure was a consistent theme throughout the consultation process and this is reflected in the Concept Design and associated report. The concept plans do take into account the need to access the wharf, as requested by NSW Maritime, and the central set of steps provides pedestrian access to the water. Despite ongoing requests for details of NSW Maritime's proposals for the wharf development, it was not until the exhibition period for the parkland concept plans commenced that Council received the opportunity to view draft plans and plans have yet to be provided formally to Council for comment.

Submissions against the SES proposal focused on the departure from the master plan that would be required for the construction of a new building and the resultant impacts of the new building on the open bushland precinct previously mooted for the north-east corner of the site. Whilst the majority of SES related submissions saw the SES as a very valuable community based organisation, deserved of top quality purpose-built premises, many expressed the view that the

Coal Loader site was not an appropriate location for the new premises, given that it was gifted to North Sydney Council as Public Open Space.

Supporters for the SES proposal also saw the industrial nature of the site being suited to the nature of SES operations and expressed the view that it was valuable to keep the SES in the local area rather than move them to a combined regional facility as had been suggested by those opposed to the use of the Coal Loader Site.

Alternate SES Proposal

As Council would be aware there have been a number of briefings with regards to an alternate proposal for relocation of the SES to the former powerhouse building and part of the former mess building ('Option 5'), which wasn't exhibited as part of the Concept Plans public exhibition. This proposal is examined in the separate report on the SES proposals to this meeting and therefore is not discussed in detail here.

Summary

In conclusion, aside from the issue of the building proposed for the northeast corner of the site, the majority of submissions were generally supportive of the general thrust of the exhibited concepts. Should the various recommendations in this report on the feedback received be adopted by Council they will be incorporated into the Detail Designs that will be prepared as the next stage of the project. Once the detail designs are finalised they will be submitted, with associated supporting documentation, as a Development Application. This will provide further opportunity for the community and other stakeholders to have input to the proposals prior to finalisation for construction purposes.

Timing and Funding

It is envisaged that Detail Designs will be completed and a Development Application be submitted in the first quarter of 2007. Dependent on the length of the DA assessment process, it is anticipated that construction documentation could be completed by August 2007 and in readiness for onsite works to commence in October 2007.

The first stage of works, which consists of priority works to make the site safe and accessible, and works to the adaptive reuse precinct buildings, has been budgeted at \$3.2 million dollars, with the majority of this to be funded from Section 94 fund reserves. Total cost of the works proposed illustrated in the Concept Design is currently estimated at approximately \$10 million. Dependent on the outcomes on the proposal for the SES relocation to the former powerhouse, monies allocated by Council or as otherwise available from the State Government for the purpose of housing the SES in suitable premises, could be redirected towards the former powerhouse and mess building and associated curtilages. This will free up additional funding for other site works.

Once detailed designs are finalised and associated costings have been obtained, a further report will be put to Council, outlining the total proposed cost of the works and an associated staging plan in line with current and projected availability of funds.

ATTACHMENT A: COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
<p>Access - Cycle</p>	<p>I consider it very important that at several points on the site, provision is made for securing the bicycles of visiting cyclists eg. bike racks. I would suggest that the proposed “Visitors Observation Kiosk” (Section 5.2) would be a good location. Visitors would stop there to undertake way finding and obtain information. A key feature of the site is stated as being a “Sustainability Learning Centre”, which will offer solutions for sustainable living by direct example “(Section 4.2). In view of this, another suitable site would be in front of the proposed Centre.</p> <p>Many cyclists are interested in the issue of sustainability and would be potential users of this site. Section 4.5 aims to “integrate the way-finding strategy with a peninsula-wide approach”. I would suggest that way finding could also be integrated into existing Regional Bike Routes and the Harbour Circle Walk routes. If it is difficult to find space for the proposed bike racks, perhaps one or two of the car spaces could be allocated for this purpose. The master plan (p.11) calls for a minimisation of private parking on the site and encouragement of cycling would assist in this.</p>	<p>Encouraging of cycling access to the site is an important component of the overall access strategy to reduce reliance on cars. The Sustainability Centre Community Design Group has suggested that bike parking / hire facilities should also be made available.</p>	<p>1. That bicycle parking and hire facilities to be incorporated into the Detail Design proposals</p>
<p>Access - General</p>	<p>The Report makes only minimal reference to issues of access to the site, and the access appendix refers only to disabled access. The Report makes reference to a wide range of potential uses including sustainability centre, café, performances and markets on the platform. Such uses are to be encouraged if the park is to be financially sustainable and available to all Sydney residents, many of whom live outside the LGA.</p> <p>Given these proposed uses, NSW Maritime would expect a thorough transport analysis including projections for private car traffic, public transport, bicycle and pedestrian access with associated traffic measurement measures. This is no less than North Sydney Council would expect of any private proposal in the Municipality.</p>	<p>Council has undertaken preliminary analysis of current and projected traffic volumes on the peninsula and has presented these results to the Steering Committee. A more detailed traffic / parking / pedestrian access study is currently underway, that will inform the Detailed Design and Development application for the site.</p> <p>It should be noted that NSW Maritime currently has a number of proposals currently under consideration for redevelopment of maritime based assets, adjacent to the Coal Loader and elsewhere</p>	<p>2. That the outcomes of the detailed traffic / pedestrian access study currently underway be incorporated into Detail Design proposals</p> <p>3. That Council write to NSW Maritime requesting details as to projected traffic types, volumes and frequencies that would require access the wharf redevelopment and other proposals mooted for the maritime based assets on the peninsula.</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p><i>NSW Maritime requests that North Sydney Council undertake a realistic analysis of the anticipated traffic impacts of the uses proposed for the Parkland and revise the Concept Plan to include measures to address these impacts.</i></p>	<p>on the peninsula, which have potential to impact on traffic and parking in the area. In regards to the maritime assets adjacent to the Coal Loader, NSW Maritime has been requested to supply, but is yet to furnish, details of anticipated traffic volumes that would need to access the wharf proposal.</p>	
<p>Access - Maritime Activities</p>	<p>The Waverton Peninsula offers significant maritime opportunities as the history of the site attests. These include commercial and recreational activities currently undertaken in an ad hoc and inadequate manner. The peninsula provides the opportunity to integrate marine and land based activities to the benefit of all.</p> <p><i>NSW Maritime requests that North Sydney Council revise the Concept Plan to fully consider access to the water and maritime activities.</i></p>	<p>It is agreed that the peninsula offers significant maritime opportunities. This is an important value that has been communicated throughout the consultation process for both the master plan and site concept plan by all involved.</p> <p>The concept plan provides for access to the wharf via a shared access pathway. In addition step access to the foreshore is provided by way of the central steps that link the upper terrace with the water. Council supports public access being maintained to the wharf, associated activities such as the MV Cape Don, which currently facilitates an active program of community volunteers.</p>	<p>No change to plan</p>
<p>Access - Lower Terrace Path</p>	<p>It is important to make the shared pedestrian / vehicular path across the lower level as minimal as possible. This will help minimise traffic through the parkland to the redeveloped wharf. (Section 5.12 Access)</p>	<p>The shared access path on the lower terrace needs to be of sufficient design and construction to support authorised access to the wharf, whilst blending sympathetically with the parkland. It is considered that the 3m width and design detail proposed in the Concept Plan meets both these objectives</p>	<p>No change to plan</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Access - Lower Terrace Path	Precinct encourages Council to be resolute in holding firm to a maximum of three metres width for the shared pedestrian/vehicular pathway across the lower site to the Square and wharf. To convey a message of low vehicular traffic, Precinct proposes that, rather than a 'decorative paved finish', the shared pathway should convey a softer, less heavy duty message – by being made of, say, crushed granite or similar 'soft' material.	Refer comment above re width of pathway. A “less heavy duty message – by being made of, say, crushed granite or similar ‘soft’ material” is not considered appropriate for reasons of functionality and ongoing maintenance implications.	No change to plan
Access - Lower Terrace Path	I support Council in keeping the shared pedestrian pathway at a modest three metres width. Again I observe that Council could well come under pressure from NSW Maritime on the width of this access and encourage Council to take a firm stand	Noted	No change to plan
Access - Lower Terrace Path	The proposed passing bays for the shared path appear to be too widely spaced for safety. There seems to be no clear sightline between the bays as proposed. We think an additional passing bay at the midpoint of the shared path would provide adequate sightlines.	The physical constraints of the site limit the provision for passing bays. In particular a midpoint passing bay may conflict with the nearby wetland.	4. That provision for a midpoint passing bay / other options to ensure traffic / pedestrian safety on the shared pedestrian be considered during Detail Design stage
Access - Security	The careful management of public access to areas adjacent to the base and its waters, such as the Coal Loader area, need to be maintained to protect Defence's interest. To that end Defence will consider improving the Waterhen security fence immediately adjacent to the Coal Loader site from the shore to the Waterhen access roadway.	Noted	5. That Council liaise with the Department of Defence with regards to the proposed security fence
Access - Traffic	In terms of traffic management, in addition to on-base parking for approx 500 personnel, the roadway from Balls Head Road to the Waterhen gates is required to take heavy trucks and buses on a daily basis to service the needs of the base. You will be aware that unrestricted parking had attracted all day parking on Balls Head Road by city commuters, which sometimes reduced the roadway to one-way traffic.	An improved pathway in a northerly direction, past the naval lands towards the station, with associated signage will be considered in conjunction with formalisation of the road corridor parking in this area. Detail design of this facility will be informed by the traffic and parking study currently being undertaken by Arup	6. That Council liaise with the Department of Defence with regards to proposed parking / pathway and signage improvements adjacent to their property.

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>Consideration should also be given to improving pedestrian egress along Balls Head Road with signage providing direction and possible interpretation of sites along the way to the parkland area. The roadway to the Waterhen gates would benefit from the addition of a footpath to improve pedestrian safety when walking to the Coal Loader site from Balls Head Road</p>		
<p>Access – Traffic</p>	<p>Precinct strongly supports the Access principle ‘Integrate the way finding strategy with a peninsula-wide approach to access’ (Page 9). However Hassell have not gone on to prepare a plan to address this principle. Indeed it seems clear that Hassell have not looked outside the ‘site’ box shown on the Page 1 of the Concept Design.</p> <p>If this peninsula-wide approach to access is outside the Hassell brief, then Council must assign someone to prepare a peninsula-wide Access Plan in parallel so that that Plan will integrate with Hassell’s site plan. The Access Plan scope must cover the entire Waverton Peninsula. It must include present and future parklands: Waverton Park, the Former BP Parkland, Balls Head Reserve and the Coal Loader/Caltex parkland. It must address access to/between/within the parklands, by pedestrians/cyclists/motor vehicles. The Plan must cover signage for all groups. It must address on-street parking, reflecting the policy of minimal on-site parking. The Plan must be based on an analysis of all the potential traffic generators for the Peninsula, which, in addition to the parklands, will include: residential traffic, HMAS Waterhen, the new BP Industrial Waterfront, new uses for the Former Quarantine Station, a revamped industrial waterfront on the Woodleys site, and NSW Maritime’s Coal Loader Wharf plans. Above all it must seek to give effect to the Master Plan objective of encouraging use of public transport, and should therefore take Waverton Station as its starting point.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that a broader consideration of access to and from the proposed parkland site, particularly with regards to promoting safe pedestrian / public transport would have benefits for not only the parkland but the whole peninsula. A comprehensive peninsula-wide study of the nature suggested in the submission is beyond the scope of the brief for Hassell. However Council has commissioned a broader study looking at traffic and pedestrian / safety considerations on the peninsula. This study will complement way-finding / access analysis being undertaken by Hassell as part of their commission.</p> <p>It should be noted that many of the land uses listed as ‘potential traffic generators’ are developments proposed by State Government agencies NSW Maritime and the Dept of Commerce. Accordingly a comprehensive study will be reliant on these agencies providing the relevant information on the proposed developments.</p>	<p>7. That the outcomes of the Arup study, looking at traffic and pedestrian / safety considerations on the peninsula, be incorporated into the Detailed Designs for the site</p> <p>8. That Council write to NSW Maritime and the Department of Commerce requesting that they provide information pertaining to the proposed redevelopment of the peninsula maritime sites, in particular with respect to anticipated traffic generation and associated impacts.</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Access – Traffic	I can find nothing elsewhere in the Concept Design which addresses the objective to “integrate the way-finding strategy with a peninsula-wide approach to access”.	Refer note above	Refer recommendation 7. above
Café	I am not confident that visitor numbers would be sufficient for a café to be commercially viable, especially if cars are to be discouraged. I would prefer not to have commercial interests at the site.	Feasibility study has shown that a small café facility is likely to attract a reasonable level of patronage. Some commercial return is required to offset maintenance expenditure	No change to plan
Café	One suggestion is that the café should have a view of the water with external seating.	Both of these items are proposed in the Concept Plan and will be developed further in Detail Design phase	No change to plan
Café	Precinct strongly opposes the proposal to break a kiosk hole in the wall, thereby defacing the beautiful sandstone wall which is one of the gems of the Coal Loader. Passer-by café patrons can easily walk inside the Street to the café to buy their coffee.	Noted	9. That the proposal for café service window in the sandstone wall be deleted
Café	We support the provision for a café in one of the existing buildings. We do not support there being any break in the sandstone wall to provide for kiosk sales. It will be a pleasant experience to enter the site for refreshments and there is no need for such an incursion.	Noted	Refer recommendation 9. above
Café	There can not be a hole in that magnificent sandstone wall for coffee on the run!	Refer note above	Refer recommendation 9. above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Caltex Site Office Area	Options c and d for the ex Caltex site are unacceptable. The land is zoned bushland and any development on bushland will require rezoning. This would contravene the spirit of the master plan which had designated that area for landscaping and extension of the existing bushland. The site is the entrance to open space parkland “a pleasure garden” as described in the Design Concept. The entrance should welcome visitors to parkland and should begin the journey through this stunning site. It should be a green and open welcome not a vast area of bitumen for trucks to turn and park.	The exhibited concept plans (excluding SES new building options) showed the bulk of the Caltex site office structure being demolished and replaced with a lightweight structure that could be used for shelter / potting etc	<p>10. That the plan be amended to show all of above ground Caltex Site office structure as to be demolished.</p> <p>11. That the ground level slab only be retained for interpretation of site history and for possible future use as community allotment garden / nursery / seating space</p> <p>12. That the adjacent bushland be retained and extended.</p>
Caltex Site Office Area	The old Caltex office at the entrance to the site is of no significance and should be removed to make way for bushland. Possibly, in the future, this may be the site of further allotments as the garden precinct below proves popular with the locals.	The Caltex Site office structure is of low heritage significance but the opportunity exists to retain ground level slab only for use by the community and interpretation of the site's 'layers of history'.	Refer recommendations 10 – 12 above
Caltex Site Office Area	The structure proposed at the entrance to the new park on the so-called Caltex site is neither necessary nor an enhancement. Such a structure would be a departure from the Master Plan which proposed the demolition of the existing building and revegetating the site as native bushland without the addition of any new structure. We strongly oppose the construction of any new buildings.	Refer notes above.	Refer recommendations 10 – 12 above
Caltex Site Office Area	Our only disagreement here is nevertheless a crucial one: the assertion that the ‘concept designs presented ... are faithful to the intent and recommendations’ of the Waverton Peninsula Master Plan cannot be endorsed in so far as it proposes retention and reuse of the Caltex shed at the north-eastern entry to the site. The Master Plan had clearly identified that this shed should be demolished and replaced by regenerated extended bushland.	Refer notes above.	Refer recommendations 10 – 12 above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>In support of Precinct’s argument against the retention of the Caltex shed, note that ‘The adopted Master Plan’ diagram in this section [Section 02 – Master Plan Principles (Page 2)] clearly shows the Caltex shed area as bushland.</p>		
<p>Caltex Site Office Area</p>	<p>As noted, Precinct strongly objects to Hassell’s proposal that the Caltex shed be reconstructed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a major public entry point to the green belt around Sydney Harbour envisaged by Premier Bob Carr when the Government gifted the land to the people of NSW. • Precinct disagrees with Hassell that this important corner of the site needs ‘definition’. • Rather, to stay true to Premier Carr’s vision of a green belt, the ‘strong entry sequence’ to the Coal Loader/Caltex parkland must be green space, rather than an undistinguished building, in order to make an unambiguous statement that this is Harbourside parkland. • The Conservation Management Plan, prepared by Godden Mackay Logan for the Master Plan, assessed the Caltex shed as being of ‘Low Significance’ (see Conservation Management Plan Section 8.4). • The Caltex shed clearly has no aesthetic merit. • Nor does it have historical significance - Godden Mackay Logan described it (Section 8.4) as the ‘1960s office, HC Sleigh’. In the memories of long-time residents it has always been an open shed, and this is supported by a photograph taken in the mid-1990s. Its walls were erected in recent years by the tenant. • As Hassell’s Section 02 ‘Master Plan Principles’ (page 2) demonstrates, the ‘adopted Master Plan’ shows this area as ‘regenerated extended bushland’. • The Caltex shed is an impediment to the filtered vista of the Harbour as the site is approached from the east. • In March 2003 North Sydney Council zoned the area on which the Caltex shed lies as Bushland. 	<p>Refer notes above.</p>	<p>Refer recommendations 10 – 12 above</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	The shed must be demolished and become regenerated bushland as per the agreed Master Plan vision. This will convey a strong statement that this is a green Harbourside parkland.		
Caltex Site Office Area	I support the demolition of the site shed near the northern entrance of the site closest to HMAS Platypus [sic].	Refer notes above	Refer recommendations 10 – 12 above
Caltex Site Office Area	I think the Caltex shed should be demolished and this area returned to bushland as per the Master plan. That means no ‘entrance construction’, no parking bays and definitely no building to accommodate the SES.	Refer notes above	<p>13. That no car parking be permitted on the upper terrace north of Powerhouse Building</p> <p>Refer also recommendations 10 – 12 above in regards to Caltex Site Office.</p> <p>Refer also recommendations 28,29 below in regard to the SES</p>
Caltex Site Office Area	In respect to the proposal for the Caltex Site office the concept designs are not faithful to the intent and recommendations of the master plan. The master plan unambiguously intended that this undistinguished 1960s building of no heritage significance be demolished and replaced by 'regenerated extended bushland'. In support of this point I noted that on close inspection the adopted master plan diagram [Pg 2 section 2 of the Concept Report] confirms this. The shed is not listed on the diagram of cultural heritage items [p6 Concept Report]. Godden Mackay in the Conservation Management Plan assessed it to be of low significance.	Refer notes above	Refer recommendations 10 – 12 above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Caltex Site Office Area	<p>I oppose the reconstruction of the Caltex Site office, for any purpose, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The master plan earmarked the shed for demolition, and to become ‘regenerated extended bushland’ • Council zoned the shed and its surroundings bushland • The shed has neither heritage significance nor aesthetic merit • If ‘reconstruction’ implies a new building then that is at odds with all the planning to date because the master plan made no provision for new buildings on the site • This shed is at the main entry point to the Coal Loader Parklands, and the Peninsula Parklands generally. Whatever is here will create the all important first impressions for the rest of the parklands • The strong entry statement (concept design pg 11) should be a message that this is parkland – obviously what the authors of the master plan had in mind – which will be best conveyed by the master plan’s proposed ‘regenerated extended bushland’ 	Refer notes above	Refer recommendations 10 – 12 above
Community Gardens / Nursery	Precinct proposes that the plant nursery and community gardens be located on the lower terrace well away from the bushland entry to the site. The set up should be low impact, presenting no significant implications for public use of the parklands as parklands, and easily reversible.	<p>The suggestion to locate the nursery facilities on the lower terrace is supported as this offers advantages in terms of reduced visual impacts of associated infrastructure (shade house, potting bench, bulk materials store etc) and improved vehicular access. However the opportunity exists, for example to operate some low impact nursery activities on the upper terrace near the northern end of the powerhouse building where an increased ‘street’ presence would be advantageous, for example a small display of potted specimens for public sale.</p> <p>It should be noted that there is in any event limited space on the northern</p>	<p>14. That the bulk of the proposed nursery facilities, in particular the shade house, potting bench, bulk materials store etc be located on the lower terrace</p> <p>15. That further consideration is given at a detailed design level as to how best to accommodate the proposed nursery / community allotment gardens within the spaces identified in the exhibited options and elsewhere onsite should demand necessitate.</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
		<p>portion of the Coal Loader site to incorporate a full scale nursery and extensive community allotment gardens, particularly given the need to incorporate some parking on the lower terrace area (Drawing SKO3), which has also been identified as possible location for the allotment gardens. Further consideration is therefore required at a detail design level to work out how to best accommodate the proposed nursery / allotment garden uses within the spaces identified in the exhibited options.</p> <p>Opportunity also exists to decentralise some of the related activities elsewhere on site should the demand require, for example the existing 'kitchen garden' area to the east of the sustainability centre cottage could support allotment style gardens to supplement those at the northern end of the site.</p> <p>It is further recommended that the facilities be developed progressively over time in response to community demand, rather than be imposed on the site from the outset.</p>	<p>demand necessitate.</p> <p>16. That the Nursery / Community Garden allotment facilities be developed progressively over time in response to community demand</p>
<p>Community Gardens / Nursery</p>	<p>Design Concept Drawing SK03 - Prefer Option A for Nursery & Car parking. Cars away from the main entrance to Street, helpful to have nursery in a visible spot, highlights sustainable theme.</p>	<p>Refer note above</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 14 – 16 above in regards to the nursery / allotment gardens.</p> <p>Refer also recommendation 13 above in regards to car-parking on upper terrace.</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Community Gardens / Nursery	<p>Having inspected the coal loader site this year, I strongly believe the best option in order to accommodate a functional and viable plant nursery is to position the working nursery area as close to possible to the first entry point of the site. The nearest proposal on exhibition of this option is SK03 option B, however this proposal has some minor flaws, the following need addressing: This option provides for the best delivery point of bulk materials. Has protection from westerly winds (probably prevailing). Central for workshops and day to day activities. Excellent solar access particularly for winter microclimate. Best position for drainage of irrigation back into existing pondage on site. Cheaper set up/installation (piping, pumps, drains etc) for proximity to pondage area for water recycling and water use in nursery. Garden allotments would seriously hinder the viability of the size of the nursery if they are attempted to be mixed together as in this option. Gardens should be relocated elsewhere on site; this area should be for nursery container plant production only. (based on volumes of native plants absorbed through the wider NSC community area over a calendar year).</p>	Refer note above	Refer recommendation 14 – 16 above in regards to the nursery / allotment gardens.
Community Gardens / Nursery	<p>I support options A and B because they include a community nursery. However, the space allocated for the nursery appears to be too small. Option A does not show a potting shed or an outside area where tubed plants can be hardened off. It would appear that the space allocated as “car parking” is using up land that is needed for the nursery operation. Option B does not show a shade house or an outside area where tubed plants can be hardened off. Once again, the area allocated for the nursery operations appears to be too small.</p>	Refer note above	Refer recommendation 14 – 16 above in regards to the nursery / allotment gardens.
Community Gardens / Nursery	<p>The nursery and community gardens are best located on the lower terrace away from the bushland entry. Associated structures, if any, should be of a temporary nature and readily demountable.</p>	Refer note above	Refer recommendation 14 – 16 above in regards to the nursery / allotment gardens.

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Community Gardens / Nursery	I would like to comment specifically on the drawing 'Design Concept Drawing Options Plan SK03'. The area in Option A where the nursery is positioned has no propagation shed and no area marked for plants to grow once they are put in pots. The area marked community garden seems to replace the area needed for this necessary part of producing plants. The area in Option B where the nursery is positioned has no shade house or area marked for plants to grow once they are put in pots. The area marked community garden seems to replace the area needed for this necessary part of producing plants. The area in Option C and Option D where the nursery is marked has no shade house or area marked for plants to grow once they are put in pots. The area marked community garden seems to replace the area needed for this necessary part of producing plants. In general, there are not the facilities for producing plants on any scale as the designs stand now. It would be appropriate for North Sydney to have a nursery that supplied plants for residents, landscapers, Bushcare sites, National Tree Day, Native Havens participants and schools. It would be hoped that the nursery facilities would be adequate for producing plants for all these 'clients' on a retail basis. Promoting use of native plants to residents is very 'in the grain' of sustainability and a growing niche market in nurseries. A survey of over 100 Bushcare and Streets Alive volunteers showed that a large support for the nursery is in the community with over 60% return rate of the survey, with 99% supporting the idea and expressing interest in being involved in its functioning. A nursery is a specialised facility and needs to be carefully designed at the on set. Further consultation is needed regarding this and the community gardens.	Refer note above	Refer recommendation 14 – 16 above in regards to the nursery / allotment gardens.
Community Gardens / Nursery	I support Bush Care Propagation facilities on the existing lower terrace parking lot.	Refer note above	Refer recommendation 14 – 16 above in regards to the nursery / allotment gardens.
Community Gardens / Nursery	To allow this proposed natural entrance to the parkland, the nursery and community gardens would be best placed on the lower level. (Section 5.1 The Street and Section 4.5 Access).	Refer note above	Refer recommendation 14 – 16 above in regards to the nursery / allotment gardens.

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Community Gardens / Nursery	I support a nursery located on the Lower Terrace. It is worth noting that the seedlings from this nursery will be important for the maintenance of all these extensive Peninsula Parklands. This [community gardens] concept fits well with the Concept Design Section 03vi) vision for the Thresholds as having the “quality of gardens, natural or cultivated, linking the constructed nature of the site to the more ‘natural’ quality of the peninsula”. At the same time care must be taken to ensure they do not significantly affect public movement through or enjoyment of the parklands.	Refer note above	Refer recommendation 14 – 16 above in regards to the nursery / allotment gardens.
Community Gardens / Nursery	Drawing SK03 - excellent to see Council thinking in terms of providing space for community gardens and allotments. Interested to see how the space will be allocated to? groups ? individuals for use.	Management of community allotments is to be determined as part of the site management / operational plan	No change to plan
Community Gardens / Nursery	What a wonderful proposal? I, and I’m sure many others, would love this space to be converted into a public parkland/nursery. Thank you for all the hard work that has gone into this proposal and for keeping me informed. This, I believe, will be a great gift to the community. Look forward to hearing about any future plans/progression.	Noted.	No change to plan
General	<p>I congratulate Council and their consultants Hassell Pty Ltd on the Concept Design for the Parkland on the former Coal Loader / Caltex Site, which the Carr Govt saved from redevelopment and entrusted to Council to be made available to the people of NSW as public open space. The Concept Design has generally advanced the vision which Council and stakeholders, including the community, developed over the years and which was reflected in the Waverton Peninsula Strategic Master Plan.</p> <p>The Concept Design is very good where it remains consistent with and builds upon the Master Plan vision. My strong endorsement of the Concept Design is however qualified by my major disappointment where it departs from the Master Plan vision regarding the North east corner of the site.</p>	Noted	Refer recommendations 10 – 12 above with regards to Caltex Site office

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
General	<p>As adjoining landowner the Department of Defence welcomes the Council's moves to open the Coal Loader site to the public. The Dept has found from its own experience that adaptive reuse of important heritage sites such as this one enable the public to share the experience of its unique history and location.</p> <p>The HMAS Waterhen facility has been located at Waverton since the 1940s and is currently the home port for the Navy's Mine Warfare and Clearance Diving Group. Throughout its long history with the area Defence has enjoyed good neighbour relations with the local community of the Balls Head Peninsula and regularly participates in the Waverton Precinct meeting and the bush regeneration of Waverton Green</p> <p>The Coal Loader proposal offers some excellent opportunities for both residents of Sydney and tourists. Cultural centres, cafes and site interpretation activities for the Coal Loader are supported by Defence.</p> <p>The main issues for the Dept are the need to maintain security of the base and management of traffic attracted to the parkland, including parking arrangements.</p>	Noted	Refer recommendations 6, 7 above with regards to parking and traffic

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
General	<p>The Waverton Peninsula represents a significant addition to the public land on Sydney Harbour. As such North Sydney Council are planning the Park for all Sydneysiders. A reference group that includes wider community representation including residents from other North Sydney Precincts, maritime industry, recreational boating, groups representing harbour walks, Department of Planning and kayak groups may provide Council with a balanced view of all those who have a legitimate stake in this proposal.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the Coal Loader site is a very significant addition to the public land on Sydney harbour and that the park is one for all Sydneysiders, as well as visitors from further a field. The importance with which Council takes on this responsibility is reflected in the consultation structure set up for both the peninsula wide master plan and the subsequent detailed design for the Coal Loader site, which has included extensive liaison with a broad range of stakeholders, through the Waverton Peninsula Ex-industrial Sites Reference Group, Steering Committee, all NSC Precincts, public advertisements / exhibitions/ public workshops / reports to Council etc. NSW Maritime is to be encouraged to follow similarly broad consultation principles when developing its plans for the maritime assets adjacent to the site and elsewhere on the peninsula.</p>	<p>17. That Council write to NSW Maritime encouraging the Authority to engage in an extensive and open consultation program when preparing plans for maritime assets adjacent to the Coal Loader Site and elsewhere on the peninsula.</p>
General	<p>The Waverton community has from the outset been intensively involved in the plans for the Coal Loader Parkland and is pleased to make this submission on the Coal Loader Concept Design.</p> <p>When Premier Bob Carr on 19 August 1997 announced that the BP, Coal Loader and Caltex sites were to be saved from development, he emphasised that the State Government was seeking to re-establish the Neilsen concept of a green belt around Sydney Harbour. He declared the State-owned former industrial sites around Balls Head Bay and Berry's Bay to be:</p> <p><i>All land for public use and as of today, the State Government has shelved all plans to subdivide State-owned property, foregoing an estimated \$20 million.</i></p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Refer recommendations 10 – 12 above regarding the Caltex Site Office.</p> <p>Refer also recommendations 28,29 below in regard to the SES</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>Furthermore, in section 5.4 of his Statement the Premier went on to say:</p> <p><i>The NSW Government recognises that it has a responsibility to contribute to the protection of Sydney Harbour Foreshores. The NSW Government has shelved plans to subdivide State owned land on the Sydney Harbour Foreshore at Berry's Bay (Balls Head). The State Government will forgo an estimated \$20 million from the planned residential subdivision.</i></p> <p><i>... A task force comprising representatives of Council, community and Government agencies was established by Council to consider future use of the site. There was broad agreement on the task force that zoning part of the area as waterfront industrial would be in keeping with the harbour's historic uses and would also complement the existing use at Woodley's Marina...</i></p> <p><i>The NSW Government has decided that the balance of the area at Berry's Bay (Balls Head) should also be preserved as <u>public open space including the historic coal loader</u>.</i></p> <p>Waverton Precinct has a long history of involvement in the BP, Coal Loader and Caltex becoming public open space. The Waverton Peninsula Task Force in the mid-1990s was chaired by one of our members. The Precinct has a deep experience of the subsequent planning for the Coal Loader parkland, through participation in the processes leading to North Sydney Council adopting the Waverton Peninsula Strategic Master Plan in 1999. We have maintained an ongoing involvement in planning and oversight on behalf of the community through participation on the Waverton Peninsula Ex-Industrial Sites Steering Committee.</p> <p>Firstly, the Precinct evaluates the Concept Designs as generally very good and congratulates North Sydney Council and its consultants Hassell Pty Ltd for an excellent job in taking forward the Master Plan to the next stage. Precinct congratulates Hassell for their exciting and interesting proposals. The concepts</p>		

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>generally capture the vision which has guided the thinking of the Council parks officers and the Precinct, which is for an emphasis on soft landscaping with a minimum of hard surface apart from the retention of the heritage elements on the site.</p> <p>However in the following submission Precinct will be expressing its disappointment and concern that Hassell have departed from the intent and specifics of the Master Plan recommendations in one very important respect. Hassell have proposed retention and reuse of the Caltex shed at the north-eastern entry to the site, against the clear intention of the Master Plan that this area was to become regenerated extended bushland. This unfortunate proposal by Hassell has been compounded by some officers and Councillors within North Sydney Council who have turned the concept of 'adaptive reuse' on its head by extending the Hassell brief to include plans for re-locating the North Sydney SES to new buildings on the site of the Caltex shed. This is further discussed [elsewhere]</p>		
General	<p>Much better to remove the coal loader and return the land to original condition. The council should stop living in the past and move forward.</p>	<p>This suggestion is contrary to the principles of the strategic master plan not supported from a heritage point of view.</p>	<p>No change to plan</p>
General	<p>General concept effective and thoughtful, particularly wish to see emphasis on natural environment rather than built structures. Keep all of the Coal Loader as open space! And don't build SES facilities on site, don't remove any trees! Plant more! Provide space for bush regeneration and propagation. Provide no extra parking on the site! Keep Coal Loader platform open for possible performance space! I support the use of the buildings as a sustainability centre. Follow the master plan as closely as possible.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Refer associated recommendations</p>
General	<p>Congratulations on the report and the vision</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change to plan</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
General	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the concept plans, currently on exhibition, for the Coal Loader Site at Waverton.	Noted	No change to plan
General	Precinct supports the site specific principles on the Sustainability Learning Centre, Indigenous Culture, Cultural Heritage, Natural Heritage, Water and Access on Pages 5 to 9.	Noted	No change to plan
General	So much effort and good will has been put into acquiring the site and developing the Master Plan for the Waverton Peninsula, that Council should be commended for its achievement in acquiring the Coal Loader Site and its proposed development of the sustainability centre and associated parkland.	Noted	No change to plan
General	I wish to object to the proposed plan at Balls Head. It appears to be an over kill. Balls Head is the most natural reserve nearest to Sydney's CBD, it would be a great loss if more cars, trucks, cafe's were allowed. Waterhen is busy enough.	Some increase in traffic is inevitable when the proposed parkland and associated adaptive reuse precinct is opened to the community. However the peninsula wide master plan and subsequent Coal Loader / Caltex Site concept designs seek to encourage use of public transport to access the site.	No change to plan
General	I wish to show my support for the need to be consulted on the redevelopment of the Coal Loader site at Waverton.	Noted	No change to plan
Heritage - Aboriginal	In particular I applaud the opening up of the area around the Aboriginal whale rock carving, exposing more sandstone, and planting a heath. (Section 5.11 The Thresholds)	Noted	No change to plan
Heritage - Aboriginal	Also, could something be done to keep the weeds out & drainage of the water around the Aboriginal art site opposite the building?	Drainage will be installed and new planting proposed as part of detailed design	No change to plan
Heritage - Industrial	I have a large knowledge of the loaders history and I wonder what's going to happen to the old coal hopper. I have looked at it and easily and very cheaply restorable. I would suggest it be moved down to the tunnels on the old track bed, it is the only one of three left and the only one in original condition.	Consultancy brief calls for restoration of the Coal Hopper car.	No change to plan

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Heritage - Industrial	After viewing the existing buildings on the site we did not feel that all of them had any great heritage merit, some definitely need to be preserved but others are not in any way aesthetic or of interest.	Noted	No change to plan
Heritage - Natural	I am in support of the proposed design for the coal loader site, however I do not support the removal of any existing trees from the site (especially mature and potentially hollow-bearing trees). I would rather see the design modified slightly to accommodate existing trees.	It is necessary to remove some existing trees eg for example for reinstating of the authorised vehicular access way in order to achieve the objective of a functional pedestrian 'street'. Replacement tree planting will be undertaken.	<p>18. That any proposed tree removal to be kept to absolute minimum</p> <p>19. That replacement trees, of a species indigenous to the area, be replanted where a tree has to be removed</p>
Environmental	NSW Maritime supports the emphasis on environmental sustainability over much of the site. However, it is noted that there is potential that soils at the site may contain elevated levels of contaminants as a result of past activities. Assessment of any risks associated with the activities would need to be undertaken to determine the suitability of the site for the activity and to identify any remedial measure that may be required.	Previous contamination studies have been carried out that indicate a low likelihood of contamination. Further analysis is to be undertaken in conjunction with preparation of detailed designs and prior to lodgement of a DA submission.	No change to plan
Master Plan	The Design Concept otherwise is to be applauded for maintaining the spirit of the Master Plan and the integrity of the site.	Noted	No change to plan
Master Plan	We support the concept of the general Master plan for the site, and its adaptive reuse of the buildings and the interpretation of the Aboriginal carvings.	Noted	No change to plan
Master Plan	As a general comment, we applaud the Concept Plan for the way in which it keeps faith with the Master Plan for the Waverton Peninsula. The consultants are to be congratulated. If implemented it will make a major contribution to the variety of land-based recreational facilities around Sydney Harbour. Notwithstanding our enthusiasm for the Plan, there are some points we mention for your consideration.	Noted	No change to plan

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Master Plan	In general I find the Concept Design to be very good and true to the Master plan.	Noted	No change to plan
Master Plan	The Report does not accord in several instances with the above mentioned documents that are adopted by Council. Both reports highlight the fact that the wharf is an integral part of the land site and both propose uses that will enable the wharf to be retained and reused.	<p>The Concept plan is in keeping with the principles of the Master Plan for the site and envisages the wharf as an important and complimentary adjunct to the parkland site. Accordingly the concept plan sees the wharf's retention and sensitive redevelopment as being important, and facilitates access to the wharf via the shared access pathway.</p> <p>Nothing in the concept plan precludes the wharf from being retained and reused.</p>	No change to plan
Master Plan	I urge Council to proceed with the original Master Plan and not allocate portions of this property to special interest groups. It is imperative that all the originally PLANNED natural bush be preserved. The granting of access to the Coal Loader site to either of these special interest groups will generate unfavourable traffic and parking issues, not to mention loss of proposed natural bushland. Both the SES and Marine Services proposals might lead to further requests for more of the Coal Loader site in the future, such as for parking. While the State Emergency Services carries out important community activities, the State Government should provide this organization with suitable accommodation, in keeping with its propensity to generate considerable traffic. Council might be able to liaise with the State Govt in an attempt to facilitate acquisition a suitable site for the SES.	Refer Notes under SES below	Refer recommendations 28,29 below in regard to the SES

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Master Plan	As this site has been given to the people of NSW it should be kept as open space according to the Master Plan and no part of it should be rezoned.	Further advice on rezoning is being sought however it is not envisaged that rezoning will be required if the SES option for the powerhouse is adopted (refer separate report to this meeting). This will be further explored in the DA submission	No change to plan
Parking	The new park is expected to be an iconic harbour side attraction that regularly draws many visitors. The Concept Plan, rightly, does not provide onsite parking and we support this principle. However it will be necessary to plan for off-site parking in the neighbouring area and Council should undertake to demonstrate how this can be achieved.	<p>The concept plan does provide for limited on-site (authorised) parking only sufficient to cater for authorised vehicles accessing the adaptive reuse precinct eg for deliveries, tenant parking and maintenance. No public parking is proposed for the site, in keeping with the Waverton Peninsula Strategic Master Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that a review of parking in the area surrounding the parkland is required to better regulate & formalise currently uncontrolled parking. This will be further explored during the detailed design stage with the aim of providing increased parking availability in the area surrounding the park. For example there is a significant amount of unregulated parking in the surrounding area particularly on the Balls Head Reserve loop road.</p>	20. That further opportunities to increase / better regulate on-street parking in the area surrounding the parkland are to be explored during the Detailed Design stage.

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
<p>Parking</p>	<p>The report emphasises that car parking on the Parklands is to be limited a maximum of 8 spaces. This conclusion does not appear to be based on any analysis. Observation of any harbour front park in Sydney (Nielsen Park, Bradley’s Head, Pymont Point to name a few) shows that people visiting the park will inevitably park in surrounding streets and on vacant land and verges. Uncontrolled parking places pedestrians and other traffic at more risk than managed parking provision.</p> <p>NSW Maritime requires a minimum of 12 spaces to provide for service vehicles and users of the proposed Balls Head maritime precinct. Council have suggested that the wharf could be used for public car parking. However NSW Maritime considers this would degrade the heritage and visual significance of the wharf. The wharf will contribute an additional 3,300 square metres of public open space. The parklands site is extensive in area and the topography lends itself to the development of well-sited car parking which is visually unobtrusive and safe for all park users.</p> <p><i>NSW Maritime requests that North Sydney Council revise the Concept Plan to show how parking will be managed on and off-site and to include a minimum of 12 spaces for the Balls Head Maritime Precinct</i></p>	<p>The Waverton Peninsula Master Plan proposed 'limited parking [onsite] for building [adaptive reuse precinct] parking only' and identified a possible 14 spaces on the lower terrace. The number of onsite spaces was reduced for the Concept Plan following more detailed analysis of the physical constraints, an assessment of the needs of the adaptive reuse precinct and community feedback with regards to further minimising onsite (authorised vehicles) parking.</p> <p>In keeping with Council policy for Public Open Space no public parking is to be permitted onsite.</p> <p>NSW Maritime’s request for parking for the wharf to be located on the parkland is contrary to previous discussions and assurances from NSW Maritime officers that all parking associated with the wharf would be accommodated on the wharf itself. The Waverton Peninsula Strategic Master Plan does not permit parking for the wharf on the parkland. Council officers have previously advised NSW Maritime in writing of this.</p> <p>It is considered that wharf based parking for wharf tenants is achievable without adversely affecting either the heritage or visual significance of the wharf. Council officers have previously forwarded plans to NSW Maritime indicating how this could be achieved.</p>	<p>21. That Council write again to NSW Maritime advising that the provision of parking of cars for the wharf redevelopment is not permitted on public parkland.</p> <p>Refer also recommendation 20 above with regards to on-street parking.</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Parking	I do not support providing parking on the Coal Loader Site.	Refer notes above	Refer recommendation 20 above
Parking	<p>Precinct strongly opposes provision of any parking on the upper terrace, as it conveys a totally inappropriate message at the main entrance to the parkland.</p> <p>Precinct considers it preferable to substitute on-street parking for on-site parking as far as possible. Precinct notes and supports the reduction in parking on the site from 14 places in the Master Plan to 6-8 places.</p>	<p>Refer note above.</p> <p>Also note: that should the proposal for the SES in the powerhouse proceed (refer SES below) the opportunity exists to further reduce the required onsite parking as SES staff and volunteers will be require to park on-street. The alternate use mooted for the former powerhouse was for commercial office use and it was proposed to provide at least two spaces onsite for prospective tenants of this facility, which would not be required should the SES utilise the building. This would provide additional space for the nursery / community garden facility.</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 13 above with regards to parking on the upper terrace.</p> <p>Refer also recommendation 20 above with regards to on-street parking.</p> <p>22. That the opportunity be explored (in conjunction with SES powerhouse proposal) to further reduce the authorised onsite parking from 8 spaces to 4 in order to provide more space for the proposed nursery / community allotments</p>
Parking	I support all of the principles stated [Page 9 Section 4.5]. Minimisation of on-site parking is to be commended. But why not limit on-site parking to essential service vehicles only? After all, this is a public open space parkland, with adaptive reuse of some heritage industrial elements. Most workers are not provided with on-site parking at their office. So why here?	Refer notes above	<p>Refer recommendation 13 above with regards to parking on the upper terrace.</p> <p>Refer recommendation 20 above with regards to on-street parking.</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>I oppose provision of any parking on the upper terrace, as being a totally inappropriate message at the main entrance to the Peninsula Parklands. As noted above I would be happy with no parking on site except for essential service vehicles. If there must be parking then it should be tucked away on the lower terrace.</p>		<p>Refer recommendation 22 above with regards to further reducing authorised onsite parking</p>
Parking	<p>The draft Concept plans provides little parking for the general public and the reliance on public transport to a single feature site may not succeed. To ensure the long term viability of the area, more parking for café customers and site visitors should be considered to prevent conflicts with existing commuter parking.</p>	<p>Refer note above. No public parking is permitted on site.</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 20 above with regards to on-street parking.</p>
The Platform	<p>Precinct supports the overall thrust of Hassell’s plans for the Platform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Platform is a great public structure, and one of the icons of Sydney Harbour. • Precinct contends the Platform should not be over-engineered and should retain a ‘soft’ appearance. • Precinct strongly supports the proposal to let uses for the Platform emerge over an extended period, during which time no permanent changes should be made to the Platform. Precinct strongly opposes any permanent re-surfacing while the long term uses emerge. Precinct supports the proposal to ‘float’ a deck over part of the Platform to support community activities such as markets, performances and informal sport, while having no permanent implications for the surface. • Precinct supports achieving early use of the Platform for informal recreational activities. An example might be North Sydney’s travelling skateboard ramp. Another example would be provision of basketball / netball hoops on courts on the deck. <p>Precinct wishes to flag its opposition to any proposal which might come up to install wire mesh nets around courts. In the context of the horizontal ‘flatness, scale and simplicity’ (Page 3) which</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>With regards to wire mesh enclosures, such an installation would not be desirable or permissible from a heritage / visual impact point of view. Also sporting groups who have been consulted in relation to recreational opportunities for the platform have acknowledged that such enclosures would be impractical given the constraints of the site.</p> <p>The existing ramp at the northern end of the platform does not meet the required access standards. Accordingly a new ramp is required. However it is acknowledged that the design of the current ramp needs further resolution to reduce its impacts on the character of the platform and so that it works more efficiently from a circulation point of view.</p>	<p>23. That installation of permanent mesh enclosures not be permitted on the Coal Loader Platform</p> <p>24. That more detailed consideration be given to the design of the accessible ramp to the Coal Loader platform to reduce its impact</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>makes the Platform such an icon, such nets would be visually jarring. Precinct recognises this might exclude some sports. But the reality is this is not an ordinary suburban park. It is unique heritage structure, with a weathering surface, prominently located, high up, at the very edge of the Harbour, subject to strong winds, and therefore not appropriate for every activity which can be carried out in normal suburban parks or playing fields.</p> <p>Precinct applauds the excellent innovative idea to open up the view from the Platform by a ‘ha ha’ dropping down the platform edge and balustrade.</p> <p>One area where Precinct disagrees with the Concept Design is the proposal to build a long steel access ramp along the eastern side of the platform as this would compromise the future use. This would take up a very large section of the Platform which could be better used as a protected place for sitting beneath foliage spilling over the back wall of the Platform. Precinct is aware of the need for disabled access, but considers there is more than adequate graded access at the northern end.</p>		
The Platform	<p>The platform with a removable deck is an admirable first stage to the usage of this magnificent space. Let its potential unfold slowly. In particular, the ha ha is a brilliant device for opening up the view.</p>	<p>Noted. Further detailed design resolution is required for the deck to maximise its functionality</p>	<p>25. That the design for the floating deck be given further consideration during the detailed design stage</p>
The Platform	<p>The attached analysis (“A”) of views from the coal loader platform indicates that the north-western corner has the best outlook up the Parramatta River. We suggest that the viewing facility should be concentrated in this area.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>26. That the issue of views to the Parramatta River be given further consideration during the detailed design stage</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
The Platform	Precinct would like to see the statement ‘... one of the great public platforms ...’ figure more prominently in the overall document, with a view to discouraging and dissuading short-term expedient decisions which could destroy the uniqueness of the platform for all time.	Noted	No change to plan
The Platform	We do not support the proposal to place trees on top of this industrial heritage item in order to shade the viewing area. Rather, we think the area should be shaded by structures sympathetic to the industrial heritage of the site, softened perhaps with vines supported by its framework.	The proposal for use of trees on the platform is one that requires further design development to determine its feasibility. In addition the strategic master plan proposed the possibility of modular shade/ rain shelters integrated with photo voltaic (solar) panels for the platform. These are envisaged a modular, sculptural elements, sympathetic to the grandeur of the platform and evocative of the sites industrial past.	27. That options for shade on the platform be further developed during the detail design stage including the concept for modular shade / rain shelters integrated with the proposed solar panels
The Platform	We support removal of the balustrade on top of the western wall, and the lowering of the adjacent pavement. If Cyclops steps were incorporated, they would provide a seamless change in level and function well as seating for people viewing the River. See Sketch (“ B ”)	Noted	No change to plan
The Platform	We support the low-key approach to the future use of the platform on the basis that major works to the deck surface should be avoided until its use is more clearly defined. The provision of shade will be important.	Noted	No change to plan. Refer also recommendation 27 with regards to shade provision
The Platform	I support only casual sporting facilities on the platform.	The concept report recommends only 'informal active recreation facilities. Informal active recreation is not feasible due to site constraints	No change to plan
The Platform	I also endorse the concept of no permanent structure on the platform (Section 5.6), and like the improved view of the western harbour by dropping the balustrade down out of sight (Section 5.7).	Noted.	No change to plan

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
The Platform	In regard to the platform itself I would endorse any suggestion to allow the recreational use of this space to evolve gradually - this could be an excellent venue for cultural and artistic activities.	Noted.	No change to plan
The Platform	I applaud the concept designs for the platform, particularly the idea of a floating deck to enable use while still protecting the vulnerable weathering surface, whilst the long term uses of the platform emerge over time. The treatment of the platform edge and balustrade is excellent. I think Council should provide very early access to the Platform for informal recreation. This should include seating and provision of basketball / netball rings for informal games. I hope that the platform will be trialled for art / sculpture exhibitions, and performances as part of the evolution of long term uses.	Noted	No change to plan
SES	<p>The following should not be construed as opposition in any way to the SES which is a great community organisation.</p> <p>For all the reasons given [elsewhere] I am opposed to any new building in the vicinity of the existing Caltex shed. I am therefore opposed to construction of a new building or buildings to accommodate the North Sydney SES, as proposed in Options 5.1C and 5.1D.</p> <p>It is not appropriate for North Sydney Council to seek to rezone this land in order to meet a standard responsibility of Councils to provide suitable accommodation for the local SES. The State Govt had foregone considerable revenue by saving the ex-industrial sites on Waverton Peninsula from real estate development.</p> <p>The Government entrusted the land to Council to make available to the people of NSW as public open space as part of a green belt around Sydney Harbour. Council should not betray that trust for reasons of financial expediency.</p> <p>This should not be about Council's budget in 2007. It is about public access for the people of NSW to the foreshores of Sydney</p>	<p>As evidenced by the extent of feedback received, the proposal to construct new premises on the site, in an area previously designated as bushland, has been a very controversial issue. Whilst the SES is seen as a very valuable community based organisation, deserved of top quality purpose-built premises, many concerns have been raised with respect to variance of the proposal from the adopted master plan for the site and associated potential impacts that a new building might have. That the Coal Loader site was gifted to North Sydney Council as Public Open Space and the master plan for the Coal Loader site does not provide for the erection of new buildings adds validity to these concerns.</p> <p>In response to the level of community opposition to a new building and subsequent to the exhibition of the</p>	<p>28. That Council not support the proposed erection of a new building for the SES on the Coal Loader site</p> <p>29. That Council give consideration to the proposal for the SES to be accommodated in the former powerhouse building, with shared use of part of the former mess building, as detailed in a separate report to this meeting.</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>Harbour for generations to come.</p> <p>In addition to the foregoing rezoning arguments, I have further concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is totally inappropriate, at this major entrance to the parkland, for there to be an area dedicated to special non-public uses, regardless of how worthy the special uses may be as a community organisation. This inappropriate location is made worse by the large area of hardstand required to accommodate the SES manoeuvring. I share Hassell's concerns (page 13, Sect 5.1C) about the 'great visual impact' of the hardstand • I was surprised and disappointed at the quality of the reports to Council, particularly those of 5 December 2005 and 20 February 2006, which appear to underpin Council's position leading to the extension of Hassell's brief to provide Options 5.1C and 5.1D. I was surprised that the list of alternative sites reported to Council included a number of parks but failed to identify the SRA land behind Waverton Station, which when later suggested appeared to have sufficient merit to warrant an approach to SRA (subsequently rejected). The costing analysis was seriously flawed: harbour side land valued at zero; an \$170,000 off-the-shelf building, with zero excavation costs; whereas the architect envisaged a stone building dug into the hill. <p>Given the history of the site I strongly urge the Council General Manager to assign an independent outside consultant to give effect to Council's resolution of 7 August 2006.</p> <p>Lastly the Coal Loader is not the only possible location for the North Sydney SES. It was not inevitable that the Coal Loader / Caltex sites would be saved from real estate development. Which begs the question: If the Coal Loader / Caltex Site had not been saved from development, what site would Council now be considering for the SES?</p>	<p>Concept Designs and an alternate proposal for relocation of the SES to the former powerhouse building and part of the former mess building ('Option 5') was developed. This proposal is examined in the separate report on the SES proposals to this meeting and is not discussed in detail here.</p> <p>Refer also separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
SES	SK03 Options C & D - SES buildings would dominate in either option, if these cannot be accommodated off the site then more design options needed.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	<p>RE: Sketches of options for coal loader site. File: CLProposed_SK03web.pdf.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My preference is for the part of the referred to in the above diagram to be used by the community as a community garden (Option A), not by the SES. • My very strong preference is to create community space in preference to space for “private” use by the SES. This is an amazing location and should be for all the community, not just a single community group. • There are other sites throughout the area (ie industrial office/ warehouse space at St Leonards/Artarmon) that are better suited to the requirements of the SES with much better road access to the majority of North Sydney local government area. It would be a real shame to lose a significant part of such a wonderful site to a single community group which simply needs an office/ warehouse to meet at and store their equipment. NSW Government needs to be approached to pay the lease costs of such premises to the SES. 	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I wish to express my concern about enactment of the community vision for the Coal Loader Site at Waverton. For many years the community has been under the expectation that the Coal Loader would become community access. However, I have recently become aware of attempts by the State Emergency Service and Maritime Services to stake claims to portions of this property. I urge Council to proceed with the original Master Plan and not allocate portions of this property to special interest groups. It is imperative that all the originally PLANNED natural bush be preserved. The granting of access to the Coal Loader site to either of these special interest groups will generate unfavourable traffic and parking issues, not to mention loss of proposed natural bushland. Both the SES and Marine Services proposals might lead	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>to further requests for more of the Coal Loader site in the future, such as for parking. While the State Emergency Services carries out important community activities, the State Government should provide this organization with suitable accommodation, in keeping with its propensity to generate considerable traffic and require parking. Council might be able to liaise with the State Govt in an attempt to facilitate acquisition a suitable site for the SES. I am particularly concerned about reports (unsubstantiated by myself) that many people who have signed petitions or voted in resolutions in support of acquisition of the a portion of the Coal Loader site by the SES, may not have understand the issue. Council should carefully consider whether these gestures of support for the SES acquisition are truly valid and meaningful.</p>		
<p>SES</p>	<p>In January of this year I took over as the Local Controller of the North Sydney Unit of the NSW State Emergency Service (SES). As you are no doubt aware the SES is an Emergency Service Organisation predominantly made up of volunteers. We are principally funded and supported by local council and enjoy a productive and positive working relationship with our Local Council. The SES is the agency within NSW that is responsible for Storm and Tempest response across the state and this is particularly relevant in the North Sydney Local Council Area. During the last 12 months your local SES has assisted the residents of North Sydney on more than 100 occasions. North Sydney Council have recently entered a community consultation phase regarding the Balls Head redevelopment at Waverton. This redevelopment includes a new Local Headquarters for the North Sydney SES Unit. Your local SES volunteers are excited about the prospect of finally gaining a purpose built home after more than 25 years in a range of 'make do' accommodation.</p> <p>The principal advantages of the proposed new building are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will be a purpose built facility that will significantly increase the ability of your local SES Unit to assist you when you need them. • It will reuse an existing building with historical significance. 	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will be located with other community groups that involve volunteers • It will not reduce existing bushland areas • It will be an environmentally friendly building and create synergies with the proposed environment centre. 		
SES	Coal Loader site at Waverton is “open space land” for which a Master plan has already been produced, not industrial or semi-industrial. Please upgrade present accommodation.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	There is no place for extraneous activities, whether they be the SES or vehicle access/parking for boat owners. Keep to the vision!	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I like the basic plan for the Coal Loader Site. However I feel very strongly that it is most inappropriate to locate the SES headquarters in the proposed area as the site is intended to be dedicated as public parkland. The proposed SES building would require rezoning and it would be at the entrance to the sustainability centre. I don't understand why the SES cannot combine / co-locate premises with Willoughby/Mosman at Artarmon. Locating it out of the way on a narrow peninsula is insensitive to the land use.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	All of the options show the location of the vehicular access in an area where intact indigenous bushland already exists in good condition. For vehicle access at point, at least 4 Angophora costata would need to be removed. These are species that are protected by North Sydney Council's Tree Preservation Order and they are located in an area zoned Bushland. The proposal suggests ripping up the old road and laying a new one through the existing bushland. To remove bushland and rip up the present road, both that are in good condition, when an already made driveway and road exists on the east side, does not make sense economically or ecologically. In addition to this, the angle of the proposed vehicle road compared to the existing road, is at a sharp angle and would be very sharp for most large vehicles. There is an old gate there, but sharpness of the turn is probably why the road was never built. The present vehicle access is the best location for it. Pedestrians can access the site in line with this, just a few metres to the east	<p>Refer note above and separate report to this meeting re SES proposals.</p> <p>Regarding the concept of 'The Street' and the proposed new exit onto Waterhen Road, this entry is necessary to allow functional one way vehicle access (authorised only) to the adaptive reuse precinct and to separate pedestrian and vehicle entry. Whilst there will be a small area of regenerating vegetation lost, this will be compensated by removal of the existing tarmac east of the powerhouse building and restoration of this area as a heath garden surrounding the aboriginal carving.</p>	<p>No change to plan.</p> <p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>and therefore negate the removal of the existing bushland. Of the Options put forward (A, B, C and D) Option C is the worst of the four. The proposed SES facility totally destroys all of the upper bushland area, the best bushland on the whole Coal Loader site. I am totally against this Option C. This should be a very interesting project and, if done well, will be an asset to the people of North Sydney.</p>		
SES	<p>No new buildings on the site! No parking on the site! Support reuse of existing buildings! Don't rezone any of this land!</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>
SES	<p>In general I am pleased with the plans which have been put forward for the Coal Loader but would like to voice concern about the plan to designate this area as the preferred site to relocate the SES Headquarters in particular as the intention seems to be to put it right at the entrance to the site. It is obviously important to find an appropriate location for an important local voluntary organisation like the SES, however Council should be thoroughly analysing and costing other options in the municipality and if there is no option but to alienate public open space then the relative cost and convenience of other possible areas of public open space in the municipality should also be compared. I understand this costing process in regard to the Coal Loader's suitability has not been adequately undertaken to date. In principle I would object to land that has been designated public open space being rezoned for other uses.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
<p>SES</p>	<p>As a strongly held matter of principle, Waverton Precinct opposes any change to previously agreed zonings of land as Open Space and Bushland. In this context, it is quite inappropriate to relocate the SES to the Coal Loader site. This opposition is not directed to the SES itself, a valued community support organisation. Rather, the Precinct is concerned that consideration of this issue may not have been made in full knowledge of the history of this valuable and unique site. The land was gifted to Council by the State Government to ensure that the foreshores of Sydney Harbour be protected for public access. On 19 August 1997, Premier Bob Carr issued a statement in which he said</p> <p>“The NSW Government recognises that it has a responsibility to contribute to the protection of Sydney Harbour Foreshores. The NSW Government has shelved plans to subdivide State owned land on the Sydney Harbour Foreshore at Berry’s Bay (Balls Head). The State Government will forgo an estimated \$20 million from the planned subdivision....”</p> <p>The Premier noted that a task force, comprising representatives of Council, the community and government agencies had agreed that part of the area at Berry’s Bay (land adjacent to Woodley’s Marina) should have a waterfront industrial zoning and that “...the balance of the area, including the historic Coal Loader, should be preserved as public open space”.</p> <p>There followed a period of more detailed planning and community involvement resulting, in March 1999, in Council’s adoption of the <i>Waverton Peninsula Strategic Master Plan</i>. In March 2003, showing a commendable commitment to the principles of the master plan, Council rezoned the coal loader site largely as Public Open Space but with certain critical areas at the entry to the site zoned Bushland. This was clearly a considered decision based on the intentions of the Government, a commitment to the long-held aspirations of the community and the Council’s planning principles.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>The master plan and Council’s own zonings preclude development such as proposed on behalf of the SES for three main reasons: (i)A development for community purposes such as that proposed is not permitted in either the Public Open Space or Bushland zones; ii)the master plan makes no provision for new buildings anywhere on the site; and iii)the entry to the site is proposed to be regenerated bushland, not a large building with hardstand parking area as required by the SES</p> <p>The Precinct shares Council’s concern that the SES should be located in appropriate premises and commends its resolution of 7th August to further consider the alternatives for the SES development. We suggest that this may best be carried out by an independent consultant.</p> <p>Throughout this long process there has been a commitment at all levels of government to public participation and community involvement in determining the most appropriate future uses for this valuable land. It would be a betrayal of this commitment and trust if a proposal inconsistent with all that has been previously agreed is allowed, simply as a matter of financial expediency. Waverton Precinct looks forward to an opportunity to meet and discuss this matter further with you.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	
<p>SES</p>	<p>In relation to the additional Option for the site which envisages emergency services accommodation there, we do <i>not</i> support any re-zoning of the site by variation of the general open space zoning that presently applies to it, or by a site-specific addition to the permissible uses for the site, to permit an emergency services depot to be located within the existing buildings, or otherwise. The land was transferred to North Sydney Council by the NSW Government for open space, and we think that should govern its use.</p> <p>From our viewpoint, the emergency services do not appear to <i>need</i> waterfront accommodation.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>The convenience of having accommodation available on site for some use compatible with its open space purposes should not be dissipated by an <i>ad hoc</i> and opportunistic assignment of occupancy to emergency services. For example, the peninsula landform of the site raises important questions about its accessibility, and the site is well away from the population centre of the Council area it is intended to serve.</p>		
SES	<p>The Consultants have prepared two plans, as instructed by Council, to show how the SES could be accommodated on the site. In fact both plans show just how unsuitable, destructive and intrusive such accommodation would be. In both plans open space and/or bushland are to be replaced by a large special purpose building and hard-standing areas which create visual obstruction across the entrance to the central street axis of park. The Master Plan and its zonings do not permit this development. There should be no rezoning simply as an expedient resolution of Council's responsibility to find suitable accommodation for the SES.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>
SES	<p>I do not support providing SES facilities on the Coal Loader Site.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>
SES	<p>The Coal Loader site was given to North Sydney Council in trust to provide the people of New South Wales with access to public open space on the harbour foreshore. North Sydney Council should not use the Coal Loader site to solve a budgetary problem such as how to meet its obligation to properly accommodate the SES, or any other similar worthy organisation for that matter. However, the decision by Council to rezone part of the site to accommodate the SES can only be condemned. I was shocked and disappointed to discover the inclusion of SES facilities on the concept plans.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>
SES	<p>My understanding is that the Coal Loader Site has been acquired by Council as a gift from the State Government for use as open public space. It is beyond belief that Council is considering putting a purpose built SES facility at the Coal Loader Site. The inclusion of the SES was not mentioned in the Master Plan Principles and it was certainly not mentioned at the Community</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	Workshop I attended on 12 November 2005.		
SES	The proposed siting of the SES facilities as the entrance way to the Coal Loader Site is not only an abomination but also unsafe as visitors will have to negotiate emergency vehicles and training operations before arriving at the Street. I am amazed that Council would contemplate compromising the Master Plan and the Coal Loader Site to allow this to be considered.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	Locating the SES at the end of a peninsula accessed by a minor road is bad planning. The Navy's compound on Balls Head Road is in constant use by heavy and light vehicles and traffic blockages are a common occurrence. SES units need to be able to respond to emergencies quickly. For this to be assured, their facilities need to be located close to major traffic routes.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	The costs of providing new facilities for SES units is extremely high. The Ryde SES facilities which were opened in November 2005 cost a staggering \$2,000,000 with Ryde Council contributing \$1,200,000 for the construction alone, the State Government contributing \$50,000 and Ryde Council also providing land for the site conservatively valued at around \$750,000.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	SES units require large hard areas for their emergency vehicles as well as car parking facilities for the 20-30 volunteers who attend training sessions.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	For the amount of money needed to provide suitable SES facilities I would expect that more appropriate sites with access to major traffic routes would be considered by Council.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	One has to ask, what the cost of the land at the Coal Loader Site would have been had the Council tried to purchase it from the State Government independently of acquiring it by way of gift for the purpose of public open space.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
SES	I believe that the Council will compromise any future negotiations for acquisition of public open space with the State or Commonwealth Governments if it is seen to rezone this gifted land to meet its own needs. This act by Council could sound the death knell for the proposed acquisition of Graythwaite.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I believe it is inappropriate to alienate public open space for the emergency services building. It would be better located elsewhere in an “industrial” site eg under the Harbour Bridge approaches, next to Pacific Hwy or share with Council’s works depot Ernest St.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	Our main issue is with the SES which we don’t think is appropriate for the site. The Waterways proposal for a marina on the wharf should also be on the agenda.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	As a Ross St resident I would not support the SES move unless there is a legally enforceable guarantee from the SES and North Sydney Council that local residents, will not have to endure many extra cars/parking (more than 5 - 10 cars would be too many) or see a replication of the “eyesore” we already have from the Navy’s old equipment piles and appalling car parking area along Balls Head Rd, spoiling the western harbour vista and risks from the dangerous speeds Navy Personnel travel along that road.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I have reviewed the points for and against the SES being located at Balls Head. It does seem to be an inappropriate location for such a group, being on such a prominent headland that has been undergoing such fabulous restoration. Much as it would give me comfort to have the SES so close to home, I trust that an alternative site can be found.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I would like to formally register my opposition to the proposed/ planned move of the SES area headquarters to the Balls Head site at Waverton and the proposed rezoning of the Coal Loader foreshore.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	As a resident of Waverton, and North Sydney resident of 34 years it disappoints me to think that the Balls Head site could possibly be considered for redevelopment. I think parts of the new design concepts are fantastic and will benefit the local community.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
SES	Having two infant children (and a dog), the open space parkland on the foreshore (without heavy traffic/development) is very exciting. Hopefully a place that my kids can take their children and tell of fun memories had. Please look a little harder to find an appropriate base for the SES, and limit the future development of this special public place!	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	2. My preference for the site to be used by the community or by the SES.3. My very strong preference is to create community space in preference to space for “private” use by the SES. This is an amazing location and should be for all the community, not a small community group. There must be other sites throughout the area (eg industrial warehouse space in Artarmon) that are better suited to the requirements of the SES. It would be a real shame to lose a wonderful site such as the coal loader site to a community group which basically needs a warehouse to meet at the store their equipment.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I would like to register my strong opposition to the proposed SES Headquarters at the Balls Head Site. Waverton is a small suburb, and while I respect the work of the SES and their need for a base, their existing North Sydney location would seem to be geographically better suited to serve the community. Waverton is at the end of a peninsula - not an ideal location from which to distribute services. The placement of this facility at Balls Head will put further strain on Bay Road, with both the addition of heavy vehicles and the increase in daily local traffic. The existing traffic noise on Bay Road from heavy vehicles is rapidly approaching unacceptable levels for residents. The suburb of North Sydney contains mostly business residents who will not be disturbed by the emergency services outside office hours. It would be a much more appropriate choice. As a side note, the traffic in Bay Road has increased disproportionately over the last 5 years, a traffic study to suggest possible improvements would be most welcome.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I wish to show my non-support for the relocation of the North Sydney SES unit from their current premises to a purpose built Headquarters as part of the redevelopment of the Coal Loader site	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>at Waverton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTA should be encouraged to upgrade the present accommodation for the SES. The current location appears to be in a quite suitable area apart from the lack of comfort. • If this is not possible, an alternative location should be found, possibly in conjunction with the Artarmon branch. This should benefit people in general as in an emergency both teams could work closely together. • Platypus site should also be considered. • Proposed Waverton area is unsuitable as new buildings are proposed to be built on “Open Space land” for which a Master Plan has already been produced. • Proposed Waverton area is unsuitable as new buildings are proposed to be built on “Open Space land” for which a Master Plan has already been produced. • The SES would add considerably to the noise, high speed traffic, and parking problems in the Waverton area. <p>We all appreciate the SES are a worthwhile institution but should be located in a more industrial type environment.</p>		
SES	I do not support this type of uninformed lobbying of my local govt.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I am OPPOSED to the SES Headquarters at the Balls Head Site, Bay Rd, for reasons that seem inexplicable, is already overloaded with traffic for a suburban street. It only leads into and out of Waverton, but we have trucks storming down it at 3am and all other hours of the day and night already. In the five years I have been a resident this traffic has increased substantially. We were promised a traffic study. Instead, you want to add sirens to the cacophony.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>Waverton is a little suburb. I respect the work of the SES and their need for a home but find them somewhere in North Sydney to live. I do not want to have my days and nights disturbed by sirens attached to fast moving vehicles going up and down my street. I also don't want the added daily local traffic associated with this facility. Also Waverton is at the end of a peninsula which is not an effective place from which to distribute services. The suburb of North Sydney contains mostly business residents which will not be disturbed by the emergency services outside office hours. It would be a much more appropriate choice.</p>		
SES	<p>I also strongly object to receiving a form that only offers agreement as an option of reply.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>
SES	<p>I TOTALLY OBJECT TO THE COAL LOADER BEING USED FOR THE SES OR ANY OTHER ORGANISATION LIKE IT. BAY RD IS DANGEROUSLY BUSY WITH THE NAVY TRAFFIC, WANDAKIAH TRAFFIC, UNI & SCHOOLS AS WELL AS PEOPLE USING IT TO AVOID THE PACIFIC HWY. DO NOT DESTROY THE AREA AS WAS DONE WITH THE BP SITE.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>
SES	<p>I would like to formally register my opposition to the proposed/planned move of the SES area headquarters to the Balls Head site at Waverton.</p> <p>As a resident of Waverton it disappoints me to think that the Balls Head site could possibly considered the preferred location for such a large group, not for profit or not. The disadvantages of this location are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proximity to primarily residential areas, impacting noise levels at ALL times given the SES respond to emergencies which clearly occur not only on weekdays • limited access to the site ie. all traffic will enter and leave via Bay Road, significantly impacting noise and traffic volume on one access road • impact to a prized, publicly utilised harbourfront area given the volume of traffic and usage by such a large organisation. 	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	<p>Clearly it would be more appropriate to house the area SES headquarters in a location more suited to and able to cope with traffic volume and industrial usage such as the Artarmon industrial area. I know I am not the only resident to object to the proposed move of the SES to this site and I would be very disappointed if a determining factor is cost given the council would minimise additional cost housing the SES in an already owned site, regardless of the other downsides of such a decision.</p>		
SES	<p>As long as it does not remove existing native vegetation or impact or have environmental or noise level impacts, I am in support of the relocation of the North Sydney SES unit from their current premises to purpose-built headquarters as part of the Coal Loader site redevelopment.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>
SES	<p>We agree that SES should be located in this area, with the 2 storey office building (Opt.2) BUT question their need for an exclusive mess hall; what about other volunteers eg bushcare workers! The Street is a shared pathway and at the South end only allows authorised vehicular access which is good and should thus exclude any private cars that may want to go to the Wharf. This is very important to minimise vehicular traffic from the environmentally sensitive parkland.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>
SES	<p>After attending the public meeting, and visiting the site we can understand that Council is in a difficult position as far as the best options for this site. Ideally it would be lovely to have it all preserved as a public park, however there does not seem, by the discussions, that the SES has any other site available to them. We therefore reluctantly support the siting of the SES at the Coal Loader Site. Our preferred option is Option D, however we think that SES should be made fully aware that any increase in their parking bays would definitely not be allowed. As we all know everyone wants to have unlimited parking however on this site and with Council's philosophy on very limited vehicles accessing the site it would be totally inappropriate for more parking spaces to be made available to them. Be assured that we have not come to this decision lightly and should any other site become available for the SES we would more than happy to consider any alternatives.</p>	<p>Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 28,29 above</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
SES	<p>I support the establishment of the SES North Sydney Headquarters (Option D) at the Coal Loader site in Waverton in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assist in maintaining a safer community. • use this particular public space in a manner which both reflects the needs of the community and ensures the volunteers of the SES are provided with the resources they require locally to assist the community in times of disaster. • provide the SES with facilities which allow them to attract and retain new volunteers and ensure their volunteers feel valued in the community, while ensuring the site is used in sympathy with green space and environmental sustainability initiatives. 	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	This is to support the SES establishment option D.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	<p>I recommend Planning Amendment Option D to North Sydney Council. The State Emergency Service is a valuable voluntary resource in any council area which the residents are happy to make use of, would like to turn up quickly but don't want located too close to their own houses. While I personally consider that this may not be the ideal location for the State Emergency Service North Sydney Unit to relocate to, I also recognise that no matter where you try moving it to, the local residents won't want it. As a member of Willoughby-Lane Cove SES, I have an idea of how many hours volunteers put into to training and would estimate that the members of North Sydney unit donate in the region of 5,000-10,000 hours to the North Sydney community every year. With around 1,000 hours spend doing storm and tempest jobs in the area. On nights when you say to yourself "Who would want to be out on a night like this?" I can tell you the SES members would prefer not to be, but they are, so at least give them a nice place to return to between jobs.</p>	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I wish to show my support for the relocation of the North Sydney SES unit from their current premises to a purpose built Headquarters as part of the redevelopment of the Coal Loader site	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	at Waverton.		
SES	I wish to show my support for the relocation of the North Sydney SES unit from their current premises to a purpose built Headquarters as part of the redevelopment of the Coal Loader site at Waverton. SES do a fantastic service & need to be supported 100%. They do what many of us would not do. Please support them.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I wish to show my support for the relocation of the North Sydney SES unit from their current premises to a purpose built Headquarters as part of the redevelopment of the Coal Loader site at Waverton. I strongly support this initiative. They aren't making any more land. Whatever is available for local people should be secured for the community & the expediting of neighbourhood services particularly in an area so saturated by commercial imperatives.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I think it is a good idea for the SES to be given appropriate premises as part of the redevelopment of the Balls Head Coal Loader. I look forward to seeing the site developed and linked to the old BP oil storage site.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	The Coal Loader site presents a unique opportunity to provide a resource which will serve the entire community. In its current form it can really only serve the local community, that is, people who live within walking or cycling distance. By not providing adequate parking, people who would otherwise like to use this park would be forced to go elsewhere. If an SES base were to be built there, the Coal Loader would have a facility which would serve the entire community. The base would only take up a small area of the entire park, be 100 mtrs from the nearest house, have minimal impact on the local community. For the foreseeable future, this land is the only available area that meets SES requirements and does not impact the local community adversely. I believe that incorporating the SES base within this development will enhance the value of the Coal Loader to the community. It would not "take over" the park, but rather, be an integral part of it.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
SES	We see no problem with the relocation of the Nth Sydney SES to a purpose built headquarters at the Coal Loader site in Waverton, it sounds like a good idea to us.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I support the proposed relocation.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I believe the Council has found an excellent facility for the ses to relocate to. Having studied the proposed plans I consider the plan is environmentally friendly and deserves the support of all residents. The SES is an essential organisation in a heavily populated area such as the North Sydney municipality.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I would like to register my support for the SES in their quest for a new HQ at Balls Head. As a predominantly volunteer organisation, the SES do a fantastic job. Their efforts would be even further enhanced with access to a purpose built facility. I hope Council will support them in their bid to relocate to the Coal Loader site at Waverton.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I am in favour of the SES proposal. I like the idea of keeping a working community not just window dressing the environment.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I strongly support the proposed SES facility at Ball's Head Road, Waverton.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I write in support of locating the new N. Sydney unit SES base at the site of the new sustainability Centre. The unit will be able to operate more effectively to serve the community in their role as the first response service for storm and flood from the new base. Road access to the new site is easier than the current location and less susceptible to flooding (preventing vehicles entering/existing the Middlemiss St. base).	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I support this proposal: - it is well designed, fits into the area well and does not encroach on bushland around - is purpose built and near to the area it aims to service.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I would like to show my support for the SES relocation to Balls Head.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
SES	I wish to show my support for the relocation of the North Sydney SES unit to a purpose built headquarters as part of the coal loader site at Waverton.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	This is a fantastic opportunity to integrate the SES volunteers with the other Volunteer Organisations on the Site. That's what "Community" is all about.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I support the SES move to Balls Head.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
	I support the proposed SES move to Waverton at Balls Head.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	We strongly support the relocation of the North Sydney SES unit from their current premises to a purpose built Headquarters as part of the redevelopment of the Coal Loader site at Waverton.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I'm writing to support the proposal that a new headquarters for the North Sydney SES unit be established as part of the Coal Loader site redevelopment at Balls Head. As a Waverton resident, I feel that this use of the site maintains utility of the site while being in keeping with a community-based use for the site. The SES performs invaluable work throughout NSW and the local unit deserves a purpose-built facility to help them continue on with this work.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I support the relocation of the North Sydney State Emergency Service to new headquarters at the Waverton Coal Loader site.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
SES	I would like to write in support of the proposed new SES base at Balls Head Rd Waverton. The SES is a vital important organisation run by volunteers and they deserve a decent place to work. I had to call them 2 years ago when storms hit my house and they could not do enough to help me and my family.	Refer note above & separate report to this meeting on SES proposals	Refer recommendation 28,29 above
The Street	Precinct notes that Hassell envisage removal of a small section of regenerating bushland to facilitate access to the Street. Precinct expresses its strong wish that such removal of bushland be kept to	Noted	Refer recommendation 18, 19 above.

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
	an absolute minimum.		
The Street	The Street area sounds exciting.	Noted	No change to plan
The Square	Precinct commends the plans for the Square as a low key passive recreation area and is pleased to note there is no provision of parking and that access is by a narrow low key shared pedestrian/vehicular pathway.	Noted	No change to plan
The Square	The Square should have minimal intrusion, a place for families to picnic.	This is the intent of the concept plan	No change to plan
The Square	I expect that in due course Council will come under pressure from NSW Maritime or its associated commercial developers and operators for on-land facilities to support activities on the wharf. I therefore support plans for The Square, especially the quite modest amount of hardstand planned for adjacent to the wharf.	Noted	No change to plan
Interpretation	The Dept Defence would be willing to assist in interpretation material relating to the purpose and operation of HMAS Waterhen. The Dept views that a better understanding of Australia's defence operation through the explanation of HMAS Waterhen base will serve both the Council's and Defence's broader objectives.	Noted	30. That Council liaise with the Department of Defence with regards to proposed interpretive signage.
The Thresholds	The threshold area between the buildings and Balls Head Road is a heavily used pedestrian route to Balls Head. It can be anticipated that with the additional attractions at the coal loader it will be even more heavily used. There is a need for a low key, but clearly defined pathway, through the new heath gardens, past the rock carvings and onwards. As part of the general consideration of access there would be merit in providing an improved pathway in a northerly direction, past the naval lands towards the station.	<p>The Concept plan provides for a replacement of the current informal road access east of the powerhouse with informal gravel pathways in sympathy with the adjacent aboriginal carving. This pathway will be low-key but clearly defined. Minor adjustments to the layout of this pathway can be made during the detailed design phase to address any concerns raised.</p> <p>An improved pathway in a northerly direction, past the naval lands towards the</p>	<p>31. That minor adjustments to the layout of this pathway can be made during the detailed design phase to address any concerns raised regarding through access.</p> <p>32. That further consideration be given to a pathway and associated pedestrian facilities north of the site to Waverton Station during the Detail Design stage</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
		<p>station will also be provided in conjunction with formalisation of the road corridor parking in this area. Detail design of this facility will be informed by the traffic / pedestrian study currently being undertaken by Arup.</p>	
<p>The Thresholds</p>	<p>Re 5.11 - The Thresholds (Pages 37 and 38), Precinct strongly supports the idea of entering the site through garden-like thresholds, including the indigenous heath garden near the whale carving.</p> <p>Precinct wants to keep the upper threshold as natural as possible using local regenerating plants. This means the nursery and community gardens would be best located on the lower threshold. But Precinct wishes to make clear that it opposes any car parking at the upper threshold entrance. This does not fit into the Hassell A or B naming scheme, but can be characterised as ‘Option - Nursery on lower terrace/No parking on upper terrace’. Precinct supports the trade-off of increased gardens for reduced parking on-site.</p> <p>Precinct points out the importance of using locally sourced plants, and the need for care to be taken in the development phase to avoid disturbance to the integrity of the surrounding bushland.</p> <p>Balls Head Drive is a heavily used jogging/power walking route. Precinct proposes that a fairly direct path be provided through the upper threshold to cater for those joggers/walkers who might otherwise cut across and destroy the heath.</p>	<p>Refer to notes above re Nursery / Garden Allotments</p> <p>Refer to note above re gravel pathway east of powerhouse</p>	<p>Refer recommendation 14 – 16 above in regards to the nursery / allotment gardens.</p> <p>Refer recommendation 31 above in regards to gravel pathway east of powerhouse.</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
The Thresholds	I like the indigenous heath garden surrounding the whale carving.	Noted	No change to plan
The Tunnels	Precinct supports the imaginative plans for the Tunnels. The use of Tunnel 2 as an access way connecting the Coal Loader to Balls Head Reserve is an exciting prospect.	Noted	No change to plan
The Tunnels	The tunnels are destined to become a major drawcard. Accessing Balls Head Reserve via a tunnel is a wonderful prospect. The possibility of an interactive light artwork is exciting.	Noted	No change to plan
The Lookout	Precinct applauds the way the design of the Street leads to this observation point.	Noted	No change to plan
Wharf	We support the continued use of the old collier berths and the bunkering wharf for maritime uses such as berthing of MV <i>Cape Don</i> . Maritime uses on this site could be integrated with the proposed maritime activities at the old BP site at Torpedo Bay.	Determination of the tenure for the wharf structures is the responsibility of NSW Maritime. However the principle of retaining berthing for large vessels such as the MV Cape Don is seen as important to maintaining a link with the sites industrial maritime heritage	No change to plan

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
<p>Wharf</p>	<p>The Concept Design Report consistently fails to address the wharf which is a major feature of the site, its history and its context. Despite repeated requests from NSW Maritime for an integrated approach to the design of the parkland and the wharf, North Sydney Council have planned the parkland separately. NSW Maritime has provided Council with concept sketches indicating the likely future uses of the wharf and surrounding wetland area. Please note that the photographs on the cover and the contents page both feature the wharf structure prominently.</p> <p><i>NSW Maritime requests that North Sydney Council consider revising the concept plan to reflect an integrated plan with coal loader wharf proposals, including public access onto the wharf.</i></p>	<p>The Concept plan is in keeping with the principles of the Master Plan for the site, both of which envisage the wharf as an important and complimentary adjunct to the parkland site. Accordingly the concept plan sees the wharf's retention and sensitive redevelopment as being important and facilitates access to the wharf via the shared access pathway. As noted previously, nothing in the concept plan precludes the wharf from being retained and reused.</p> <p>Despite ongoing requests for details of NSW Maritime's proposals for the wharf development, it was not until the week that the exhibition period for the parkland concept plans commenced that Council received the opportunity to view draft plans and plans have yet to be provided formally to Council for comment.</p> <p>Public access on the wharf deck as proposed by NSW Maritime is to be applauded and public access from the parkland to access the deck is provided for in the Concept Designs.</p>	<p>33. That Council write to NSW Maritime requesting that the draft plans of the proposed redevelopment of the wharf are provided to Council and the community for comment.</p>

COAL LOADER / CALTEX SITE WAVERTON - CONCEPT DESIGN PUBLIC EXHIBITION - SUBMISSIONS MATRIX (continued)

Issue	Comment Received	Notes	Recommendation
Wharf	The development of the Marina is to be suppressed at all costs.	As noted above retention of the wharf structure is seen as important. Redevelopment of the wharf is the responsibility of NSW Maritime, who have indicated that a commercially viable proposal is required to enable the wharf to be retained. The parkland concept plans provides for the wharf to be retained. Any proposed redevelopment needs to be sympathetic to the wharf's heritage status and the adjacent parkland environment.	No change to plan