



Report to General Manager

Attachments:

1. Summary of Submissions Received
2. Submissions Received

SUBJECT: Draft Plan of Management/Masterplan for Tunks Park – Post Exhibition

AUTHOR: Megan White, Landscape Architect/Planner

ENDORSED BY: Rob Emerson, Director Open Space and Environmental Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

North Sydney Council's Plans of Management are strategic documents that provide a consistent and useable set of guidelines for the effective short and long-term management of all open space owned or under the care, control and management of North Sydney Council.

A combined significant area Plan of Management/Masterplan has been prepared for Tunks Park in response to a resolution made at the Council meeting on 21 March 2016.

The new draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park was completed in August 2018. Public exhibition of the draft document was widely advertised, and known stakeholders were also informed that the draft PoM/Masterplan was available for viewing and comment.

The public exhibition and submission period ran for 6 weeks, until 24 October 2018. A total of 192 submissions were received. This report sets out the content of the submissions, and the alterations it is proposed to make to the draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park as a result. The report also describes the key issues addressed in the draft document and lists the investigations and works to be undertaken in Tunks Park coming years.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Council has currently funded within the Delivery Plans capital works program \$100,000 in 2019/20 and a further \$100,000 in 2020/21 for the implementation of the Management/Masterplan. The cost of the improvements identified in the Management/Masterplan have not yet been entirely costed however there will be a significant shortfall between the allocated funding and the required funding that will need to be considered in future budget deliberations.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. THAT** Council formally adopts the draft Plan of Management/Masterplan for Tunks Park.
-

LINK TO COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN

The relationship with the Community Strategic Plan is as follows:

Direction: 1. Our Living Environment

Outcome: 1.3 Quality urban greenspaces
1.4 Public open space and recreation facilities and services meet community needs

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on 21 March 2016, Council resolved to prepare a Plan of Management (PoM) for Tunks Park. In particular, Council resolved the following:

- 1. THAT Council prepare a dedicated single, comprehensive Plan of Management for Tunks Park in consultation with Council's City Strategy division.*
- 2. THAT the Plan of Management include consideration of management of traffic, boat access, flora and fauna, and active and passive recreation.*
- 3. THAT the Plan of Management for Tunks Park be broadly consulted to the community.*

On 18 July 2016, Council resolved that a consultant team be appointed to undertake the preparation of the Tunks Park Plan of Management/Masterplan under the oversight of a Project Control Group led by City Strategy. At its meeting of 20 November 2017, Council resolved to proceed with a Plan of Management that excluded floodlighting and artificial turf from Tunks Park, and to transfer oversight of the Plan of Management process to the Division of Open Space and Environmental Services.

The draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park was completed in August 2018. The draft document was on public exhibition for a 6-week period, and submissions were received until 24 October 2018. Public exhibition of the draft document was widely advertised to both known stakeholders and the general community.

CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS

Community engagement will be undertaken in accordance with Council's Community Engagement Protocol.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

The following table provides a summary of the key sustainability implications:

QBL Pillar	Implications
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The principles of ESD guide Council's management of all parks and reserves, allowing current and future users to enjoy North Sydney's open spaces and recreation facilities, and ensuring that the

QBL Pillar	Implications
	environment is protected. Tunks Park has a combination of recreational, historical, scenic and aesthetic significance.
Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Tunks Park is a recreation resource for the whole community. It accommodates organised sport as well as informal activities such as bush walking, jogging, dog walking, viewing the harbour and picnicking. The boat ramp is well used by the boating community.
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The development, management and maintenance of Tunks Park requires significant, continued financial resourcing.
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Plans of Management are important documents providing clear guidelines for the effective short and long term management of all land owned by North Sydney Council or under Council's care and control.

DETAIL

Acronyms used in this Report

BOA - Boat Owners Association of NSW Inc

BIA – Boating Industry Association

AFA – Amateur Fisherman's Association of NSW, Fisheries - NSW DPI (Fisheries)

BP & STP – Bay Precinct & Save Tunks Park

1. Development of the draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park

In September 2017, a multi-disciplinary consultant team led by Environmental Partnership NSW was engaged to prepare the Tunks Park PoM/Masterplan. Environmental Partnership NSW is a qualified and experienced landscape architectural and open space planning consultancy. The consultant team included experienced transport and traffic engineers (Taylor Thomson Whitting), ecological consultants (Kingfisher Urban Ecology) and community engagement specialists (Straight Talk).

Located on the foreshore of Middle Harbour, Tunks Park is one of North Sydney's most highly valued public open spaces. It offers a range of recreational opportunities including organised sport (Tunks Park is 1 of only 7 parks in North Sydney that cater for organised sport), as well as informal uses including walking, dog-walking, using the children's playground, BBQ's and fitness equipment, picnicking and enjoying Harbour views. The Tunks Park boat ramp is a regionally significant facility, provides access to the Harbour for the boating community, and the bushland areas of the Park provide opportunities for the community to experience and appreciate nature and the environment.

The new PoM/Masterplan aims to protect and enhance the core values of Tunks Park, while simultaneously catering for the various recreational needs of the community, as far as possible, and improving visual appeal. The Project Brief specifies that sensitive upgrading rather than extensive redesign is required.

The objectives of the PoM/Masterplan are:

-
- To establish a framework to guide decision-making regarding the short and long-term use and management of Tunks Park;
 - To reflect the values and expectations of residents, workers and other stakeholders regarding the use, enjoyment, management and development of Tunks Park;
 - To ensure consistency with North Sydney Council Community Strategic Plan 2013-2023 and other relevant strategies, plans and policies;
 - To protect the environmental, social, recreational and heritage values and significance of Tunks Park; and
 - To develop a concept Masterplan that illustrates the proposed initiatives and actions.

The draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park examines the current character and condition of the park, and establishes clear directions for future development and management. It addresses relevant issues including landscape character, flora and fauna, cultural and natural heritage, access and circulation and use of the park. It identifies opportunities to upgrade and improve existing facilities and the overall condition and appearance of the Park. A Matrix sets out the major projects and programs proposed for implementation in coming years. The Masterplan is a visual representation of the proposed alterations and improvements.

1. Public Exhibition

Public exhibition of the draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park took place in September and October 2018. The draft PoM/Masterplan, together with a Feedback Form, relevant supporting documents, Council reports and other background information, was available on Council's web site for the duration of the public exhibition period, and Council staff were available to discuss issues and provide clarification upon request. In addition to the draft PoM/Masterplan, the following documents were available on the website:

- 1 Documents that support the PoM/Masterplan:
 - Tunks Park Testing Options (Engagement/Consultation) Report, May 2018
 - Tunks Park Travel Plan, June 2018
 - Tunks Park Civil Engineering Report, May 2018
 - Tunks Park Ecological Input Report, November 2017
 - 2 Council reports and other background information:
 - Council Report 27 August 2018 Anderson and Tunks Parks Plan of Management/Masterplan – Project Update
 - Tunks Park Drop-In Session Boards
 - Tunks Park Options Testing Workshop Presentation 5 April 2018
 - Tunks Park Options Workshop Presentation 4 & 6 December 2018
 - Tunks Park Scoping Workshop Presentation 9 November 2017
 - Council Meeting Minutes 21 March 2016 – Plan of Management Tunks Park
 - Council Report 18 July 2016 – Masterplans Preparation Resourcing
 - Council Report 21 November 2016 – Masterplans Consultant Brief
 - Council Report 1 May 2017 – Masterplans Tender
 - Consultant's Brief – Tunks Park
 - Community Engagement Strategy – Tunks Park
 - Straight Talk – Engagement Background Information
 - Tunks Park FAQ
-

To inform the general community and other stakeholders that the draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park was on public exhibition, the following measures were taken:

- Notices were regularly placed in Council's weekly corporate advertisement in the Mosman Daily throughout the public exhibition period
- Information was distributed via social media (Council's Facebook page and Twitter feed)
- Information was included in Council e-newsletters including the Tunks Park, Precincts and Council e-newsletters
- Information about the new draft Plan and an invitation to comment was emailed to:
 - o All Precincts
 - o Known stakeholder groups and individuals (including sportsground hirers, schools, P&F committees and other agencies (including the Aboriginal Heritage Office and the North Shore Historical Society)
 - o Council's Sport and Recreation Reference Group
 - o Councillors (via Councillor Bulletin)
 - o All Council staff
- Flyer on Council's Community Noticeboards in Civic Park

3. Submissions Received

The public submission period closed on 24 October 2018, however, this was extended until 2 November, at the request of Bay Precinct. Due to the very high number of submissions received (192), and the comprehensive nature of many of the submissions, comments have been summarised and grouped according to the issues they address. The content of the submissions and the responses to the issues raised in them, including whether or not it is proposed to amend the draft PoM/Masterplan, is contained in **Attachment 1** - Summary of Submissions Received. More detailed and comprehensive information that documents the content of submissions received is contained in **Attachment 2** – Submissions Received.

Following is a summary of the key issues addressed in the draft PoM/Masterplan and raised in the public submissions. A brief overview of the issues (as set out in the draft PoM/Masterplan) is followed by a summary of the major points raised in the related public submissions.

3.1 Tunks Park Boat Ramp

Key Proposals set out in the Draft SWCSS

The draft PoM/Masterplan identifies the boat ramp as a district facility, currently well-used and in good condition. The Implementation section of the document, identifies 2 objectives relating to the boat ramp:

1 – To minimise the impact of the boat ramp on park and local residential amenity.

Suggested actions to achieve this are:

- o Improve existing regulatory signage related to noise and related penalties
- o Enforce regulations relating to boat ramp use by Council Rangers
- o Council Rangers to follow up on resident's reports

2 – To reduce late night noise from the boat ramp that disturbs local residents (the noise is considered to be related to the use of a tap located near the boat ramp to flush out boat engines). Suggested actions to achieve this are:

- o Monitor effectiveness of removal of tap at boat ramp
- o Liaise with RMS re potential to limit or remove boat cleaning activities from Tunks Park boat ramp

- Liaise with RMS re potential to limit Tunks Park boat ramp operating hours to prevent late night use due to proximity to residences

Summary of Submissions

More than 150 submissions (including submissions from the BOA, the BIA and the AFA) strongly objected to the proposal to liaise with RMS regarding the potential to limit the boat ramp's operating hours.

Generally, the objections raised in the submissions focused on:

- 1 The regional significance of the boat ramp facility
- 2 The lack of alternative boat ramps (in the Sydney region, and particularly on the north side of the harbour)
- 3 The fact that the proposal appears to be a 'knee-jerk' reaction to the issue of after-hours noise, developed to appease one group of stakeholders, without considering the needs of another stakeholder group, or the implications of the proposal for them
- 4 The fact that the vast majority of ramp users are considerate of local residents

- *Regional Significance of the Tunks Park Boat Ramp*

- Tunks Park boat ramp is a facility of regional importance to the Sydney boating community. It was constructed to cater, 24/7, for the maritime community, and it has been identified by the RMS as a 'Regional Facility'
- A number of submissions noted that information about the boat ramp, its function and its regional significance is severely lacking in the PoM/Masterplan: '*boating should be recognised as a legitimate park activity alongside dog - walking etc.*'.
- The BIA notes that the North Sydney metropolitan area is home to approximately 2350 registered boats, of which about 50% are trailer boats.
- Submissions described the existing facilities, including facilities for people with mobility impairments, as excellent, and note that Tunks Park is one of only 2 boat ramps with trailer parking on the northern side of Sydney Harbour.
- Submissions also note the use of the ramp and pontoon extends far beyond just 'trailer boats', and includes many other users who provide essential marine services, 24/7. These include commercial operators, marina customers, Fisheries compliance vessels, marine survey services, the various trades servicing waterfront housing and other waterfront facilities and people involved in mooring, and diving and hull cleaning. Other users include people accessing boats moored in surrounding bays.

- *Reasons for Retention as a 24/7 Facility*

- Numerous submissions suggested that closure of the boat ramp outside of daylight hours is a knee-jerk reaction to the issue of after-hours noise produced at the ramp, is contrary to the wider public interest and is at odds with the previous and ongoing support of the boat ramp by the state maritime agency. They suggest that more logical options which do not unduly penalise the boating community should be pursued. The submissions state that the facility, which has existed in some form at Tunks Park for many years, is not heavily used
-

during night hours, and that those who do use it at night are generally the more responsible and proficient boat owners.

Main points provided in submissions were:

- Opportunities to access the water have decreased in recent years, making existing facilities even more important *'recommend that Council works to provide more, not less, access to waterways in the LGA'*
- The move will reduce the public's already limited ability to access Sydney Harbour
- *'Limiting hours is not an acceptable way for a public boat ramp to operate. It will mean many sectors of the community cannot access the harbour'*
- Fishing and boating is a way of life for many people, and access to the harbour and to moored boats is needed 24/7
- Placing a time restriction on the use of the boat ramp would make it unusable for most serious recreational fisherman. Fishermen need early starts to get to good fishing areas by first light. They go early or in the evening because the fish feed early and late; they have no control over fish feeding activity. The best times to fish are also dictated by weather and tides
- If the ramp was not open early, kayakers will not be able to paddle before work
- The ramp has community value not only to the residents of North Sydney but also for the greater boating population of Sydney
- Will put more pressure on Roseville boat ramp, which is already overcrowded

- *Effects of Restricting the Boat Ramp's Hours of Use*

Several submissions stated that restricting the boat ramp's hours of use would put a massive strain on the area:

- There will be a rush to get there (at opening time) and away (at closing time). *'The queues waiting for any opening period would jam the local roads'*. At these times other park users will be forced to park further away
- Closing the ramp at 10 pm has safety implications for boaters who do not make it back in time for various reasons (mechanical problems, weather conditions etc.)
- This will push the problem to other boat ramps in Sydney (particularly Roseville), and worsen congestion and overcrowding not only near those ramps, but on Sydney's road system as a whole

- *Other Ways to Overcome Noise Issues*

- More than 20 submissions strongly opposed the removal of the taps near the boat ramp, on the basis that a dedicated wash bay is an absolute necessity at one of the few practical regional boat ramps in the Sydney area. Clean fresh water is required for washing equipment and flushing engines, particularly by those living in units. Several submissions also noted that removing cleaning facilities would also pose a risk to marine biosecurity.
 - Many submissions noted that while local residents are right to complain about late-night noise, the answer isn't to punish all law-abiding boaters with boat ramp lockouts and tap removals. These extreme measures are seen as an out-of-
-

proportion and completely unnecessary response to a problem of enforcement of rules around noise.

- Numerous submissions noted that it is ‘misuse of the taps’, not the taps themselves that is the problem. They suggest that better enforcement by Council of existing controls (such as Rangers better-managing afterhours noise), and installation and enforcement of more effective signage, at more useful locations, would readily curtail then contravention of the rules.
- Several submissions claimed that since Council introduced a timer on the tap, problems with late night/early morning engine flushing have ceased, and that any noise at night now has other causes (loud music, people doing ‘burn outs’).

The boating community has responded strongly to the draft PoM/Masterplan. The quality and quantity of feedback received from organisations and individuals involved in water-based recreational activities centered around the Tunks Park boat ramp has provided Council with information needed to ensure that the final PoM/Masterplan more accurately reflects the wants and needs of all stakeholders. Details of amendments to be made to the draft PoM/Masterplan as a result of submissions on the draft PoM/Masterplan are set out in **Attachment 1**: ‘Summary of Submissions Received’.

3.2 Parking/Traffic/Access

Key Proposals set out in the Draft SWCSS

The draft PoM/Masterplan identifies access to and circulation in and around Tunks Park as significant issues to be addressed. The Implementation section of the document, identifies a number of objectives, including:

- Promoting walking, cycling and use of public transport
- Improving access to the park, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- Mitigating the impact of parked cars on driveway access
- Improving connections to the wider area
- Reducing traffic congestion in and around the park, particularly during the winter, Saturday morning peak period, by sportsfield users
- Reducing parking and circulation conflicts on Brothers Avenue
- Improving compliance with existing parking controls
- Locating parking to enable best use of the foreshore for open space and to enable views out

Summary of Submissions

- *Configuration Changes*

- This proposal was opposed by all who commented on it. ‘*The proposed changes to Brothers Ave, parking arrangements for cars and boat trailers and reconfiguration of the foreshore are not worthwhile; they would cause too great an upheaval for traffic, park users and local residents, the park would be out of action for several months and it would be a very costly exercise*’.
- Other submissions noted logistical problems with the proposed changes, particularly for people using the boat ramp.
- The submission from BP&STP noted that access for vehicles and cyclists is already challenging, with a number of ‘pinch point’ on the narrow local roads.

- *Retain (or increase) the Amount of Boat Trailer Parking Spaces*

While the submission from BP&STP supported the proposed conversion of boat trailer parking spaces into bus parking, strong objections to the proposal to decrease the number of boat trailer parking spaces were received from 35 individuals as well as groups including the AFA and the BOA. The following comments clarify the reasons for the objections.

- Numerous submissions found the proposal to reduce the amount of boat trailer parking totally unacceptable. *‘Any reduction in parking will reduce the ramp’s ability to remain a regional facility’*
- Submissions noted that the amount of boat trailer parking spaces at Tunks Park is already inadequate, and does not meet RMS standards
- Submissions also stated that reducing boat trailer parking spaces would drive trailers further up into the surrounding streets which is not a desirable outcome for anyone. Submitters stated that Council should be looking to provide more and not fewer spaces
- Several submissions suggested that it was appropriate to provide additional parking for both cars and boat trailers

- *Parking Fees*

Strong objections to the proposal to introduce fees for parking at Tunks Park were received from 28 individuals as well as groups including the AFA and BOA.

- Submissions were concerned that *‘Council is trying to make more money from the beautiful natural resource’* (Sydney harbour), and stated that boaties already pay enough in fees; *‘this would make a day on the harbour super-expensive’*. They also note that boaties have no alternative in the LGA, and they cannot take public transport to the park like other users can
- Several submissions stated that parking fees are not charged at other Sydney boat ramps, that parking fees will not ease congestion (as much of the congestion is due to sportsfield users, and boat owners have nowhere else to go)
- 3 submissions stated they would be prepared to pay for parking if Council provided improved facilities, particularly public toilets, close to the boat ramp

- *Parking*

- Numerous submissions opposed the proposed loss of boat trailer parking spaces which they believe is inconsistent with the status of the boat ramp as a regional facility and with Council’s own vision to improve access to waterways and water-based recreation (as stated in Council’s Foreshore Access Strategy). *‘More, not less, boat trailer parking is needed’*
 - Several submissions noted that parking boat trailers is *‘difficult under the best of circumstances’*, and that the proposed changes will make parking more difficult and will impede the flow of cars and cars with boat trailers
 - Several submissions emphasised the importance of the boat trailer parking at Tunks Park, noting that boaters have no realistic alternative launch sites. They also note that because people using the boat ramp have no alternative but the drive to the park (because either they have a boat trailer, or are laden with provisions), the emphasis should be on reducing the volume of cars coming to
-

-
- the park for other purposes. (for example by means proposed in the draft PoM – park and ride and ride-sharing services and public transport)
 - Several submissions, including the submission from BP&STP, supported the trialing of a shuttle-bus for sportsground users as a way of reducing congestion at winter peak times
 - Several submissions stated that there is room in the foreshore area to provide more parking, for cars as well as cars with boat trailers
 - *Proposed 6-Hour Limit on Boat Trailer Parking*
 - Over 30 submissions strongly objected to the proposal to limit boat trailer parking to 6 hours. They cite increased traffic chaos at peak times, and the fact that the proposal does not reflect an understanding of how people use the ramp: *‘The use of boats is not a short scheduled event (like a sporting fixture). Most people go boating for the whole day, some stay out overnight. People will have to limit their time on the water. This is not relaxing’*
 - *Pedestrian/Cyclist Circulation*
 - 2 submissions noted that the path along the southern side of the playing fields becomes flooded in wet weather. Measures to overcome this are recommended, and 1 submission notes that this path would be even more useful and would ease congestion at peak (sports) times if it was continued around the Park
 - The submission from BP&STP strongly agreed with the draft PoM that the steep gradients of local streets are challenging for many pedestrians, and that these gradients, along with the streets narrow width, busyness and the volume of parked cars discourage recreational cyclists, particularly at peak times
 - *Other Comments*

The major issues identified in submissions (6-hour parking limit for boat trailers, introduction of parking fees, loss of boat trailer parking spaces) are only proposed for further investigation in the PoM/ Masterplan, rather than for implementation. However, due to the significant level of concern, and taking into consideration the operational issues raised in the submissions, these proposals will be removed from the PoM/Masterplan, and will not be investigated further. The proposed realignment of Brothers Avenue, including changes to parking configurations is also strongly opposed in the public submissions, and will not be pursued.

3.3 Sportsfields

Key Proposals set out in the Draft SWCSS

The draft PoM/Masterplan identifies that the use of Tunks Park for organised sport needs to be within sustainable limits, in terms of the environment and local amenity. The draft document notes that Council’s introduction of reduced field use and scheduling changes in the 2017 winter season has improved traffic and parking congestion. It also notes that further reductions are not feasible, as all neighbouring sportsfields are at capacity, although some fine-tuning may be possible. Strategies to minimise conflicts between sports use and general informal use of the Park include liaising with sportsfield users regarding game day management strategies and behaviour.

Summary of Submissions

- *Winter Use of Sportsfields*

- Several submissions expressed gratitude for Council's reorganisation of Saturday winter sporting activities, noting that it has definitely improved traffic and parking conditions and congestion around the Park. Several other submissions suggested Council look at increased staggering of the use of the sportsfields to further improve conditions
- BP&STP agreed with the statement in the draft PoM that '*a generally agreed sustainable target for sports turf usage for local Government open space is an average maximum 25 hours of formal field usage per week. However due to the challenges of sportsfield availability in North Sydney, Council's general sports turf usage cap for formal bookings (for all turf fields) has operated at a maximum target of an average of 32 hours per week*'. (Note that formal field usage levels at Tunks Park are currently well below the maximum allowable level)
- BP&STP strongly supported Council's resolution: 'not to consider sportsfield lighting at Tunks Park'

- *Summer Use of Sportsfields*

- Submissions from local and state cricketing bodies expressed disappointment that the draft PoM/ Masterplan did not include provision of cricket training facilities (nets), citing the high level of need within the North Sydney area, particularly at locations where cricket is currently played. The submissions suggested that objections could be overcome if the cricketing bodies worked with Council and other local stakeholders
- BP&STP strongly supported the omission of cricket nets from the draft PoM/ Masterplan, and agreed with the reasons given
- 1 submission identified the need for additional changing rooms to support use of the sportsfields

3.4 Foreshore Enhancement

Key Proposals set out in the Draft SWCSS

The draft PoM/Masterplan identified that the foreshore area of Tunks Park, east of Brothers Avenue, has the potential to become an attractive destination for informal recreation. The area could be reconfigured to increase the amount of open space and to create a harbourside gathering place for the community. New facilities including seating, drinking fountains, picnic tables and kayak storage could be provided, and fitness equipment improved. Additionally, a children's nature play area could be developed, along with landscape improvements to enable visitors to get closer to the water (via decking and steps).

Summary of Submissions

- Several submissions commented on the measures proposed in the draft PoM/Masterplan to enhance the foreshore area. Most submitters were concerned that anything more than modest upgrading (facilities for kayak storage and launching, improvements to the BBQ area and upgrading the fitness equipment) was likely to attract many more users, adding to vehicular congestion and parking problems
-

- Several submitters stated that there is already sufficient foreshore open space for informal recreation, and any expansion of facilities should complement existing facilities (e.g. more car and boat trailer parking, further wash down bays)
- BP&STP do not support increased use of the park, believing this would generate more traffic, and: *'it is unrealistic to force more traffic of any kind onto the access roads'*, (primarily due to the area's topography)

3.5 Vegetation/Environment & Landscape

Key Proposals set out in the Draft SWCSS

The draft PoM/Masterplan recognises the importance of conserving the flora and fauna habitat values of Tunks Park, of enhancing the Park's function as a green corridor, of providing canopy and understory linkages where possible, and of improving bushland continuity. In addition to considering possible future plantings, the draft document also identifies the need to review recent foreshore planting; balancing the need for some shade with the need to retain views out of (and into) the Park. Creek line and water management strategies set out in the draft PoM/Masterplan focus on ways to improve water quality, reduce erosion and sedimentation and reduce storm flows.

Summary of Submissions

- Several submissions are very supportive of the plan to review foreshore planting with the aim of selectively removing some vegetation to provide better views out of and into the Park, and to increase the amount of 'sunny' areas which are valued by people using the foreshore area for informal recreation in winter. In addition, BP&STP noted the importance of North Sydney's foreshore parks as viewing points
- BP&STP strongly supported strategies set out in the draft PoM relating to provision of shade and tree canopy through the maintained grass areas to provide tree canopy continuity through the park, connect the bushland slopes visually and provide a degree on aerial habitat connection. However, several submissions disagree with the draft PoM's contention that there is insufficient canopy in the Park, noting that many canopy trees are still maturing, the sides of the Park are heavily forested, and sporting fields must remain unshaded to optimise turf condition
- BP&STP strongly agreed with the draft PoM that: *'All new plantings in Tunks Park should be appropriate and sympathetic to the desired landscape character of each section of the Park'*. They also strongly supported Tunks Park's role in protecting Sydney's natural flora and fauna, and noted that the draft PoM/Masterplan identified Tunks Park as the most important reserve for birds in North Sydney and an important wildlife corridor
- Fisheries supported the proposal to partially 'day-light' the piped creek line (although the draft PoM identified this was unlikely to be feasible), noting that if this is not economically feasible, the aquatic habitat of the currently open creek should be improved to create a natural filtration system that improves water quality. Fisheries also provides information on the management of the weir for Council's consideration

3.6 Consultation Process

Key Proposals set out in the Draft SWCSS

The consultation program undertaken by the project consultants was designed to ensure that the 'voices' of the community and other stakeholders were heard and understood. Engagement activities aimed to determine the values and expectations of local residents

and the broader community, including how Tunks Park is currently used, and how it should be managed and developed in the future. The draft PoM/Masterplan notes that the highest level of participation in the consultation program came from local residents, and that feedback from consultation has assisted in creating a framework to underpin the PoM, with a view to incorporating all environmental, social, recreational and local priorities.

Summary of Submissions

- Numerous submissions stated that because the regional boat ramp is an integral part of Tunks Park and has been for many years, the boating community's input should have been actively sought earlier in the PoM process. This would have ensured that the draft PoM/ Masterplan accurately reflected the needs of the boating community, along with the needs of other legitimate stakeholders.
 - o ...*'because the highest levels of participation in the consultation processes came from local residents, it is primarily their views that the draft PoM reflects'*
 - o *'Investigating more logical options that could benefit a variety of stakeholders of the park, while also trying to reduce the disturbance to local residents... would seem to be a more inclusive and democratic process'*
 - o Stakeholders from the local and state cricket organisations were disappointed that their stated need for cricket nets was not incorporated in the draft PoM/ Masterplan
 - o BP&STP congratulated Council and the Consultants on the draft plan: *'Throughout the planning process, the consultants have given us the opportunity to express our views. Much of what we have advocated has been incorporated into the plan'*

3.7 Other Comments

- Several submissions, including one from BP&STP reported a high level of satisfaction with Tunks Park as it currently is: *'there is a great atmosphere on a summer day; cricket, family get-togethers and fishos cleaning their catch - all at the same location – it is the true Australian lifestyle'*
- BP&STP stated a belief that Plans evolve from a vision, and have developed a vision for Tunks Park to encapsulate their views, and to support, reinforce and protect the Park into the future. They note that most of the constraints and opportunities identified in the planning process to date derive directly from the extraordinary physical setting of the Park

4. Implementation and Next Steps

Following the adoption of the Draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park, the Consultants will amend the draft document as required to produce the Final PoM/Masterplan. Implementation of actions set out in the document can then commence.

The information contained in the following Table: **'Table 1 – Implementation'** sets out some of the priority actions and projects that are scheduled to be carried out in coming years. Note that some of the listed works will require funding to implement. Note also that projects that are 'ongoing', such as bushland management activities and other maintenance work, are not included in this Table.

Table 1 –Implementation

Objective	Actions
To provide a balanced approach to tree planting within the Park (consider the environment, landscape amenity and views into and out of the Park)	Review recent foreshore tree plantings as part of foreshore open space enhancements (Council staff will liaise with interested local residents and other stakeholders prior to undertaking work, with a view to selectively removing some vegetation)
To ensure the community is effectively informed about the Park's values through on-site and web-based mediums/ To increase community awareness of the benefits of good water management	Develop integrated interpretation strategies for Park elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural environment - Aboriginal heritage - European heritage - Water conservation awareness
To control the impact of Mosquito Fish impact on aquatic habitat in the Park	Implement Mosquito Fish management program
To use harvested stormwater and roof water to contribute to Park maintenance	Investigate feasibility of providing more water storage through the harvesting system. If feasible, the tanks would be 'hidden'.
To promote walking, cycling and public transport as options for users of Tunks Park	Develop a Transport Access Guide for Tunks Park
To improve access to the Park from the North Sydney side	Upgrade the access path to Tunks Park through Judith Ambler Reserve from Currawang Street
To ensure pedestrians and cyclists can easily find their way to the Park	Increase pedestrian and cyclist wayfinding to routes to the Park and in adjoining streets
To improve pedestrian access into the Park, and improve safety for 'active travel modes' (walking and cycling)	Investigate the feasibility of providing continuous footpath to The Boulevard/ Rowlinson Parade connecting to the existing step link to the Park
To improve cycle facilities available in Tunks Park	Investigate feasibility of providing cycle racks in the Park
To reduce traffic congestion and parking conflict (during peak use times)	Investigate feasibility of providing a Shuttle Bus service from transport nodes and parking stations to Tunks Park sports fields
To mitigate the impact of parked cars that limit access to driveways	Liaise with Council's Engineering Department regarding line marking near driveways (in streets surrounding the Park) to deter illegal parking
To identify and promote the optimum emergency access route to the Park during peak periods	Promote access along Cliff and Lower Cliff Ave as the preferred route and advise emergency services, sports clubs and other relevant stakeholders
To improve compliance with parking controls to car park and adjoining streets	Liaise with Council Rangers to ensure enforcement of parking restrictions, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Boat trailer parking - Overstays in time-restricted parking spaces (including overnight stays) - Parking beyond marked parking areas in local streets, (consider particularly proximity to driveways)
To expand the existing foreshore open space area to provide facilities to support informal recreation	Investigate and if feasible provide additional facilities including seating, picnic tables, drinking fountains, kayak storage, improved fitness facilities (Note; while significant expansion and development of this area with 'people attracting' facilities are not supported, there is support for minor upgrading (including the works listed in this Action) to improve the amenity of the foreshore area
	Review the feasibility and desirability of providing a compact toilet facility in the foreshore area (this is for consideration in the long term, and is dependent upon other foreshore improvements being undertaken first)

Objective	Actions
To encourage kayak use where kayak storage occurs in a controlled manner	Investigate the feasibility of providing formal kayak storage facilities in the foreshore area of the Park
To retain and enhance provision of fitness equipment in the Park	Investigate the feasibility of integrating improved fitness equipment into the foreshore area, with another node within the main body of the Park
To ensure the role of the Park as a community gathering point is conserved	Investigate options for a loop track around the sports fields (for walkers, joggers, dog-walkers etc) Note: this could be combined with the 'gravel edge track' suggested for the north edge of the Park due to the grassed areas in this location being susceptible to wear. Construction of this track would also need to address 'flooding' problems experienced on the existing path at times of high rainfall)
	Investigate potential locations for additional seating throughout the Park, particularly related to the location of existing shady areas
To provide facilities in Tunks Park that contribute to a unified and appropriate character for the Park	Progressively update park furniture to a co-ordinated suite of elements in accordance with Council's Public Domain Style Manual and Design Code 2018 (Note: where possible, new facilities should be clustered to minimise visual clutter, and to serve multiple users best)
To minimise impacts of boat ramp use on the Park and on local residential amenity	Improve existing regulatory signage relating to noise and related penalties (also review location of signs to determine optimum locations)
	Council Rangers to enforce regulations relating to boat ramp use
	Council Rangers to follow up on reports from residents (and others, regarding infringements)
To reduce late night noise from the boat ramp area of the Park	Continue to monitor effectiveness of recently installed timer on the tap at the boat ramp (reports so far indicate the timer is successfully reducing boat ramp-related noise at night)
To provide facilities for comfortable community use	Undertake and implement the findings of Council's recent Parks and Amenities Buildings Condition Assessment
To maintain ongoing community involvement in improvement of Tunks Park	All major park improvement projects to integrate community consultation as part of the design process

5. Conclusion

The draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park is a comprehensive document sets out Council's strategic direction for management of the Park for the next 5-10 years. Management objectives, planning issues and proposed upgrading and improvement works are included in an Action Plan that shows the anticipated timing for the new works. The addition of information and comments made in the public submissions will ensure that the final PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park is a comprehensive and thorough document, and an accurate reflection of community and stakeholder needs and concerns.

There will be further opportunities for the community and stakeholders to be involved in the implementation of the PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park as the individual works set out in the document are addressed over coming years.

Draft Plan of Management (PoM) / Masterplan for Tunks Park

Attachment 1: Summary of submissions received during public exhibition period

Prepared November 2018

The following criteria are used to analyse all submissions received, and to determine whether or not the plan would be amended:

1. The Draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park **would be** amended if the point:
 - a provided additional information of relevance.
 - b indicated or clarified a change in government legislation, Council's commitment or management policy.
 - c proposed strategies that would better achieve or assist with Council's objectives.
 - d was an alternate viewpoint received on the topic and is considered a better option than that proposed in the Draft Plan or;
 - e indicated omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity.
2. The Draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park **would not be** amended if the point:
 - a addressed issues beyond the scope of the Plan.
 - b was already in the plan or will be considered during the development of a subordinate plan (prepared by Council).
 - c offered an open statement, or no change was sought.
 - d clearly supported the draft proposals.
 - e was an alternate viewpoint received on the topic but the recommendation of the draft plan was still considered the best option.
 - f was based on incorrect information.
 - g contributed options that are not possible (generally due to some aspect of existing legislation or government policy) or; involved details that are not appropriate or necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing a strategic community direction over the long term.

Note: Common acronyms used on the following pages:

BOA - Boat Owners Association of NSW Inc
BP & STP – Bay Precinct & Save Tunks Park

AFA – Amateur Fisherman's Association of NSW
NSDJCC – North Sydney District Junior Cricket Club

BIA – Boating Industry Association
Fisheries - NSW DPI (Fisheries)

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT COUNCILLORS REFER TO THE COMPLETE SUBMISSIONS MADE AVAILABLE TO THEM, AND TO THE REPORT TO COUNCIL, WHICH EXPANDS ON THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE SUBMISSIONS.

	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
	TUNKS PARK BOAT RAMP				
1	<p>More than 150 submissions (including submissions from the AFA, BIA and BOA) strongly objected to the proposal to potentially reduce and restrict hours of operation of the Tunks Park boat ramp.</p> <p>Generally, the submissions focussed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The regional significance of the facility - The lack of alternative ramps - The fact that the proposal appears to be a 'knee-jerk' reaction to the issue of after hours' noise, developed to appease one group of stakeholders, without considering the needs of another stakeholder group, and the implications for them if the proposal proceeds - The fact that the vast majority of ramp users recognise the need to be considerate of local residents and act accordingly 	<p>The POM/Masterplan will be amended, and the following action will be removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Liaise with RMS for potential to limit Tunks Park boat ramp operating hours to prevent late night use due to proximity to residences <p>Council will focus on other actions listed in the draft PoM/Masterplan in order to reduce night noise associated with the use of the boat ramp, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Improve existing regulatory signage related to noise and related penalties' - 'Council Rangers to enforce regulations relating to boat ramp use' and - 'Council Rangers to follow up on resident reports' <p>Council will also consider better locations for relevant signage, and improved education of boat ramp users regarding the need to keep noise to a minimum (particularly at night).</p> <p>Note also that the recently installed timer on the tap near the boat ramp (which prevents engine flushing at night) appears to have greatly lessened night noise associated with boat ramp use.</p>	Y	1a	117
	<p>REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TUNKS PARK BOAT RAMP</p> <p>The following comments highlight the ramp's importance as a regional facility:</p>				
2	<p>The BOA notes that providing and maintaining access to the waterways of Sydney harbour and Pittwater is a key issue as Sydney's population grows.</p> <p><i>'Our network of boat ramps is the means by which enjoyment of our Harbour is extended to stakeholders who cannot afford waterfront facilities of their own'.</i></p>	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
3	<p>The Tunks Park boat ramp facility has been identified by RMS as a Regional Facility. NSW Boat Ramp Facility Guidelines state: - "A Regional boat ramp would typically be a large-scale facility designed to accommodate a high level of usage attracted from a boat user catchment area covering several different localities. It would typically comprise a wide boat ramp with multiple lanes and sufficient manoeuvring and parking areas to handle high traffic flow."</p>	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
4	The Tunks Park boat ramp is a regional facility that has been supported with grant funding from Maritime NSW to improve the ramp itself and install floating pontoons to assist access and egress to the water. These works were funded to ensure continued safe use of the ramp as part of the boating infrastructure within the North Sydney Council area, as one of only two such facilities.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
5	One of the most important facts that is being overlooked is that this boat ramp has a very long history and is an intrinsic part of Cammeray and its Heritage value. Furthermore, NSW Maritime (RMS) have spent a great deal of money over recent years improving the boat ramp for the use of boaters and making it accessible to both disabled and all abilities persons. <i>'Significant restrictions to the boat ramp and its use make no sense'</i> .	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
6	Tunks Park boat ramp is a facility of regional importance to Sydney boating families. North Sydney Council is obliged to keep it so.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
7	This planning fails to take into account the original purpose and overall principal use of the area and the amenity it provides, 24/7, for the maritime community.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
8	On behalf of the boating industry and boating community in Sydney, the BIA notes that North Sydney metropolitan area is home to approximately 2350 registered boats, of which about 50% are trailer boats. The BIA supports boaters' access to the local waterways; i.e. the long-established and highly-valued boat ramp and associated facilities at Tunks Park.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
9	There are more than 65,000 boaties who will object to the proposal to limit the boat ramp's hours of use.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
10	One of the aims of Council's Foreshore Access Strategy 2007 is: <i>"To promote and improve access links to the North Sydney foreshore for the local and wider community from both the land and water to continue a sustainable use and enjoyment of Sydney Harbour as a unique waterfront environment"</i> . The potential changes are not consistent with Council's vision as the changes will basically reduce the current level of access for boaters who utilise this facility.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
11	Access to marine facilities within North Sydney Council has reduced considerably since the construction of the boat ramp at Tunks Park. Many of the public wharves, jetties and ramps have been removed, fallen into a significant state of disrepair or simply access locked off, further concentrating the reliance on Tunks Park, the only usable public boating facility within the North Sydney Council area. Furthermore, while demand from the boating public has increased for facilities, competitive resource users have been also funneled by Council into the limited area of Tunks Park with no expansion of parking for boating facility users or improving general access for the boating public. Note, the improvement funded by the state government (from what I understand, was also partly funded from the trust established from recreational fishing licence fees) some 8 years ago was only to the pontoon and ramp, not the general access to these facilities.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
12	The boat ramp and boat trailer parking facilities at Tunks Park are excellent. Having used the boat ramp at Tunks Park regularly for over 15 years I have benefitted from the improvements that have been made and strongly encourage there be no diminution of these facilities in the process of a long-term management plan for Tunks Park.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
13	The proposal ignores the significant use of the Tunks park ramp and pontoon by the yachting and boating community to access their yachts or motor cruisers on their private RMS Moorings in the bays of Southern Upper Middle Harbour throughout the year, an area that extends as far as the Spit to the east and Castlecrag /Cove to the North and all areas to the south.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
14	It is incorrect to assess the use of the ramp and pontoon as being limited to 'trailer boats'. The use of the ramp and pontoon also extends to commercial operators, marina customers (including the aged and disabled), Fisheries compliance vessels, the various trades that service waterfront housing and other waterfront facilities, people involved in mooring, diving, and hull cleaning and marine survey services. These users provide essential marine services 24/7.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
	REASONS FOR RETENTION AS A 24/7 FACILITY The following comments summarise the main objections to reducing the boat ramp's hours of operation:				
15	Numerous submissions suggest that closure of the boat ramp outside of daylight hours is a knee-jerk reaction to the issue of after-hours noise produced at the ramp, is contrary to the wider public interest and is at odds with the previous and ongoing support of the boat ramp by the state maritime agency. They suggest exploring more logical options which do not unduly penalise the boating community as legitimate stakeholders of Tunks Park. The submissions state that the facility, which has existed in some form at Tunks Park for many years, is not heavily used during night hours, and that those who do use it at night are generally the more responsible and proficient boat owners. <i>'There are the rare few that are not (considerate) – but is that a reason to punish a section of the community and force them to lose their access'?</i>	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
16	Numerous submissions state that Council's role is to consider what will benefit the whole community, and not to give in to the views of a vocal minority of local residents. <i>'Sydney is a harbour city, and continuously making it difficult for people to enjoy the harbour is squeezing Sydney of what makes it Sydney. These redevelopments only cater to a vocal minority who are unable to cope with people who enjoy boats on the harbour'. 'Please do not give in to the selfishness of residents living beside a public facility'.</i>	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
17	The BOA recommends educating the local community about the regional significance of the ramp, the lack of alternatives for boaters, the ramp's history as a much-loved and highly utilised feature of the LGA, and the requirements of trailer parking as a "key" access issue.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
18	Submissions from the BOA and others recommend that Council works to provide more, not less, access to the waterways in the LGA for the boating community, including, as a high priority, upgrading the ramps at Milson Park and Quibaree Park (Lavender Bay).	Refer response to Issue 1. Note also that the ramp at Milson Park is currently being upgraded, however, neither this ramp nor the ramp in Lavender Bay offer boat trailer parking.	Y	1a	117

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
19	The proposal to modify usage of the Tunks Park Boat Ramp will reduce access to Sydney Harbour. Such a move is a serious step in the wrong direction, and one that appears to pay little regard for North Sydney's duty to provide public access to the Harbour. This is a duty that is unique to only a handful of Councils, and North Sydney must play its part.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
20	The vast majority of boat ramp users respect the conditions of use, and minimise noise and other disturbance to the local community.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
21	Boat ramps require 24 hours of operation – limiting these hours is not an acceptable way for a public ramp to operate. <i>'The harbour is not just decorative; it is something that people engage with. Australia is known for its marine life and waterways - we need to be able to use it'.</i>	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
22	The Tunks Park ramp has community value not only to the residents of North Sydney but also for the greater boating population of Sydney. The Tunks Park boat ramp is a regional facility, of regional importance. Many people use this ramp and not just people from the north of Sydney.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
23	It would be great to see Council promoting the socioeconomic and health benefits of recreational fishing in the local area. Fisheries could assist Council in holding fishing workshops at Tunks Parks (promoting responsible fishing practices and providing the local community with some information on the positive influence recreational fishing can have on communities).	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
24	Many submissions noted that this is one of only two boat ramps on the northern side of the harbour that allow people access to Middle and Sydney Harbour (the other is at Roseville). We should be preserving what few facilities we have, not reducing them. This proposal would basically remove another boat ramp from use. It is completely inappropriate for the local council to attempt to restrict use of this facility.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
25	There are so few harbour access points for trailer boats. This is the only boat ramp with trailer parking in North Sydney, hence its importance.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
26	Tunks Park is the closest ramp to harbour and head lands and provides a safe sheltered place to park and launch and retrieve your vessel. <i>'Tunks Park is the best and safest option of every single ramp in Sydney. I have young children and would be forced to launch on the Parramatta River.'</i> The ramp provides a safe location for launching in adverse wind conditions that prevent or restrict safe launching at other Harbourside sites. <i>'As an older person who generally fishes alone I find that the Tunks Park ramp is the best Sydney Harbour ramp for single-handed launching and boat retrieval.'</i>	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
27	Any change to this facility places added pressure on the boat ramp at Roseville. This is not only inequitable, but the Roseville facilities are already inadequate to meet demand.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
28	The ramp at Roseville is difficult to access if you do not live on the north side of Sydney. It is difficult to access Roseville when towing a boat if travelling from Sydney's west. If travelling from the west the only other option is Wharf Road but this incurs a 39-50-minute boat ride to the harbour.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
29	Access to Sydney harbour should not be influenced or restricted by the minority (of local residents). It must be available at all times to cater for all users, including shift workers, and emergency services. <i>'Restrictions to the ramp's use will severely affect my ability to enjoy a safe and satisfying recreational activity for a person aged over 60 years of age.'</i>	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
30	The draft PoM notes that Council has a second boat ramp located at Lavender Bay. I am the only person I know who has attempted to launch a trailer boat from Lavender Bay. To claim it now as a ramp is preposterous; access to it by trailer is near impossible and the ramp has not been maintained in a workable state. There is no trailer parking available, and the traffic signage indicates it is illegal to actually park a vehicle on the ramp unless you are from Sydney Water's Maintenance Department!	Refer response to Issue 1. The Lavender Bay boat ramp caters primarily for people who store their water crafts in the Lavender Bay storage facility, or who 'carry in' their own water craft (primarily kayaks and SUP's).	Y	1a	117

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
31	If the ramp is not open until 7 or 7.30 am, kayakers will not be able to go out for a paddle before work.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
32	Numerous submissions stated that placing a time restriction on the use of the Tunks Park boat ramp would basically make it unusable for most serious recreational fisherman. <i>'I regularly use the boat ramp very early and am long gone by 3am some days'</i> . Limiting the ramp access to daylight hours is not a reasonable solution. Anyone who suggests so doesn't understand the needs of this significant user group. Fisherman need early starts to get to good fishing areas by first light. They go early or in the evening because the fish feed early and late; they have no control over fish feeding activity. Some species of fish simply can't be targeted after sunrise. The best times to fish are also dictated by weather and the (ever-changing) tides.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
33	Fishing and boating is a way of life for many people, and access to the harbour and to moored boats should be available 24/7.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
	EFFECTS OF RESTRICTING THE BOAT RAMP'S HOURS OF USE The following comments summarise the anticipated effects of restricting the boat ramp's hours of use:				
34	Many submissions noted that the partial closure would cause a massive strain on the area as it will be a rush to get there on opening and get away at closing times. <i>'The queues waiting for any opening period would jam the local roads'</i> . At 'opening' and 'closing' time, the car park will fill with cars and trailers belonging to boat users; this is likely to create safety issues with other park users due to trailers obscuring driver's views. Additionally, at these times other park users will be forced to park further away.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
35	Limiting the boat ramp's availability and not allowing access for people to retrieve their boats should they return after dark or late will also pose a safety risk. Boats will be left tied up in the limited docking zone overnight, and cars and trailers will be left for longer durations.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
36	Fisheries is concerned with how closing the ramp at 10pm will impact on fishers and boaters where unforeseen incidents occur (i.e. break downs) and boaters are unable to return to the boat ramp before the ramp is closed.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
37	Many submissions stated that partially closing Tunks Park boat ramp will push more boat traffic to other ramps and worsen the congestion and overcrowding issues that all boat ramps currently experience. There will be more cars with boat trailers on the road as people who previously used the Tunks ramp are forced to look for other options across the Sydney area.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
38	Several submissions suggested that imposing restrictions is likely to strain the relationship between residents and visitors.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 1.	Y	1a	117
	OTHER WAYS TO OVERCOME NOISE ISSUES (rather than removing taps near the boat ramp)				
39	More than 20 submissions strongly opposed the removal of the taps near the boat ramp on the basis that a dedicated wash bay is an absolute necessity at one of the few practical regional boat ramps in the Sydney area. Water use is part of the typical and uncontroversial functioning of a "regional" ramp. Clean fresh water is required for washing equipment and flushing engines; the removal of water access should not be a consideration.	<p>The POM/Masterplan will be amended, and the following 2 actions will be removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Monitor effectiveness of removal of tap at boat ramp in discouraging late night cleaning</i> - <i>Liaise with RMS for potential to limit or remove boat cleaning activities from Tunks Park boat ramp</i> <p>Council has recently installed a timer on the tap near the boat ramp and will continue to monitor the effectiveness of this in reducing night noise associated with use of the boat ramp.</p> <p>Future measures to deal with night noise associated with boat ramp use will focus on improved enforcement of existing regulations, better signage in better locations, and education of boat ramp users regarding the need to keep noise to a minimum.</p>	Y	1a	117

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
40	Wash down facilities at a boat ramp are a safety requirement. Maintenance of trailers and motors require hosing down and flushing. Modern outboard motors do not require to be run to facilitate flushing and older motors are increasingly rare amongst fishermen who would retrieve at time where noise would be an issue. The issue of engines running whilst being flushed will reduce in the coming years as motors are replaced.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 39.	Y	1a	117
41	Many boat owners keep their vessel in a garage at a unit block, and it is not possible to flush or wash a boat in this situation. These boat owners would be forced to use other 'at capacity' ramps with adequate facilities, further increasing the congestion at and around these ramps.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 39.	Y	1a	117
42	Two submissions noted that removing cleaning facilities at any ramp would pose a risk to marine bio security, especially at the cleaning table when dealing with fish.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 39.	Y	1a	117
43	Many submissions note that while local residents are right to complain about late-night noise, the answer isn't to punish all law-abiding boaters with boat ramp lockouts and tap removals. These extreme measures are seen as an out-of-proportion and completely unnecessary response to a problem of enforcement of rules around noise.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 39.	Y	1a	117
44	The draft PoM notes: <i>"Residents in the community workshop forums identified that after dark noise through engine cleaning is a regular disruption to local amenity. The presence of potable water taps in the vicinity of the boat ramp which are used by boat users has been identified as the major root cause of the noise complaints."</i> The BOA notes that this is false logic. The taps are not the "major root cause" of noise complaints. Misuse of the taps is the cause. The taps should stay for the benefit of the vast majority of responsible ramp users who need them to wash their engines, kayaks or diving gear during the day, as is consistent with the typical and uncontroversial functioning of a regional boat ramp. Several submissions suggested that more effective signage and actual consultation with boat owners will increase awareness of the need to keep impacts on local residents at a minimum.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 39.	Y	1a	81-84

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
45	Numerous submissions, including one from the BOA, stated that if Council were to provide for enforcement of existing controls (such as park rangers managing time-limited parking and afterhours noise), and install (and enforce) more effective signage in more appropriate locations (i.e. closer to the boat ramp) then contravention of the rules in place would be more readily curtailed.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 39.	Y	1a	117
46	Fisheries supports the implementation of responsible fisher education programs and implementing other management solutions to respond to the issues surrounding the use of the boat ramp.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 39.	Y	1a	117
47	The current regulatory settings imposed by various state agencies and Council bylaws covering use of the boat ramp at Tunks Park include noise regulation and parking restrictions/limitations, are understood (and obeyed) by the great majority of boaters. The new tap timers are an effective control on the number of boaters using the park and the times at which they do so. Boaters are aware that the ramp is located close to a residential area and fully appreciate and respect the quiet enjoyment of the local community.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 39.	Y	1a	117
48	Several submissions stated that the complaints related to use of the water tap at night for boat engine flushing have stopped since Council introduced the timer on the tap. Therefore, there is no need for the proposal to reduce opening hours.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 39.	Y	1a	117
49	Several submissions noted that noise at night may be caused by other users (people with loud music and doing burn outs).	Noted. Refer response to Issue 39.	Y	1a	117
50	The BOA proposes the creation of a dedicated washing bay which is not in the way of people coming to/from the ramp/trailer parking area. The washing bay should be large enough for a car and trailer to park and close (10m) to at least one functioning tap with clean fresh water.	The current level of car and boat trailer parking spaces and the configuration of the car parking and other facilities on the Tunks Park foreshore will not be altered due to the high level of community opposition to proposed changes. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2g	NA

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
51	Two submissions supported the removal of water taps to stop engine flushing, and one suggested that improved signage be placed and that the starting of boat motors out of the water be restricted totally. <i>'This will limit noise issues considerably'.</i>	Refer response to Issue 39. The need to retain a wash-down facility is clearly established in the many submissions received on this issue, and Council will continue to investigate and implement other measures to reduce noise associated with use of the boat ramp facilities. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2g	117
52	Two submissions supported removal of the "wash-down" tap and facility completely as a way to free up space and have traffic move more freely around the area. <i>'I've frequently seen a queue of boats waiting to use the tap, with the expected resultant congestion. Boats parking next to the tap can also restrict traffic flow considerably'.</i>	Refer response to Issue 39. The need to retain a wash-down facility is clearly established in the many submissions received on this issue, and Council will continue to investigate and implement other measures to improve congestion and traffic flow. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2g	117
	PARKING/TRAFFIC/ACCESS				
53	BP&STP supports the Travel Plan, development of a Transport Access Guide and provision of a shuttle bus (for Saturday sport in winter).	The draft PoM/Masterplan advocates development of a Transport Access Guide for Tunks Park as a means of promoting walking, cycling and public transport use, and to improve health and wellbeing. This project is particularly important given that the lack of support for significant changes to circulation and parking at the Park means that these measures will not be pursued. Similarly, the draft PoM/Masterplan proposes that the feasibility of a shuttle bus service from transport nodes and parking stations to sports facilities at Tunks Park be investigated. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2d	106, 108,109
54	Several submissions, including one from the BIA, supported proposals for local residents to access the park via public transport and dedicated park and ride services, but noted that this is not a workable solution for boat ramp users.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 53.	N	2d	109

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
	CONFIGURATION CHANGES				
55	<p>The draft Tunks Park POM, identifies a major issue as being traffic and parking, particularly during periods of peak use at weekends and during various sporting activities. Page 10 states: <i>"This Plan of Management has identified a focus on promoting sustainable travel to the park which seeks to reduce peak traffic volumes and parking demand."</i></p> <p>If the Draft POM seeks to <i>"reduce peak traffic volumes and parking demand"</i> there is too much emphasis on the following: turning the waterfront area into a new and inviting focal point of the park, encouraging cyclists, and on better signage and wayfinding.</p> <p>Any parking changes, need to be thoroughly trialled before implementation as they could exacerbate the situation by pushing the problem further out into surrounding streets. Further study is needed to determine the impact of the proposal on the safe and efficient functioning of the boat ramp, keeping in mind <i>"Tunks Park boat ramp is a regional facility, and any actions must be consistent with it remaining as such"</i>.</p>	<p>The draft PoM/Masterplan includes 2 options for the 'Masterplan' component of the project. Option 1 envisages little change to existing traffic and parking arrangements at Tunks Park, while Option 2 envisages major changes to these elements, including the realignment of Brothers Ave and the relocation of the car park to provide a larger foreshore 'green' space. It also proposes an 'offline' car park, adjacent to the main Tunks Park oval.</p> <p>Submissions received in response to the public exhibition of the draft PoM/Masterplan clearly favour Masterplan Option 1, for a range of reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current situation is mostly okay - Excessive cost of works for little (perceived) gain - The undesirability of creating another 'people attracting' area at Tunks Park (due to traffic and parking implications) - Potential negative impacts of the works on circulation for boat ramp users - The need to provide car and boat trailer parking facilities in this location is considered greater than the need to slightly increase open space <p>The draft PoM/Masterplan will be amended to identify Option 1 as the preferred Masterplan option, and Option 2 will be removed.</p> <p>The following Key Recommendation will be removed from Masterplan Option 1: <i>'Explore general car use of trailer parking that straddles grass for high sports use periods'</i>.</p>	Y	1a	83, 124, 125
56	<p>BP&STP support the comment in the draft PoM that: <i>'Pinch points arise when on street parking on both kerbsides limits two-way movement. This creates "friction" between vehicles in peak times as they travel into and out of the park and along The Boulevard and Cliff Avenue'</i>.</p>	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2d	109

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
57	A number of submissions state that the proposed changes to Brothers Ave, parking arrangements for cars and boat trailers and reconfiguration of the foreshore are not worthwhile; they would cause too great an upheaval for traffic, park users and local residents, the park would be out of action for several months and it would be a very costly exercise. <i>'Even in the peak period I have never had to wait more than 30 minutes to find a parking space (I have waited longer at a Westfield). Traffic to the area via access roads is often heavy, (but where isn't on a Saturday morning in Sydney?) yet generally well behaved.'</i>	Refer response to Issue 55. The proposals to change roadway and parking configurations will be removed from the PoM/ Masterplan.	Y	1a	124, 125
58	The parking at Tunks Park mostly works for everyone concerned. Yes, on summer weekends there are demands upon the parking spaces, but not so during the week. I use the park regularly and have never seen friction between drivers searching for a car space, don't believe it exists. My simple suggestion is to expand parking to take in the space of the existing fitness area and leave all other parking the same. This would be a least cost option and provides the maximum benefit. The fitness area parking could have tuff artificial grass (or green similar) and need only be open on the weekend to cope with car overflow. The fitness equipment could be slightly relocated. Everything would still look green.	Noted. Refer response to Issues 55 & 57.	Y	1a	124, 125
59	Several submissions note that the plan calls for the closure of the access road off Brothers Ave leading to the ramp from the south. This will only create chaos, conflict and safety issues at the ramp; boat trailers and general cars would be forced to queue in either of the road entrances and at times they would completely obstruct the traffic flow. <i>'This is sacrificing the functionality of a regional boat ramp for the highly questionable benefit of creating unnecessary additional "open space" for informal community use'</i> . Suggest installation of a dedicated boat queuing area that does not impede on flow of general traffic be factored into amended proposal. The design shows the boat trailer turning bay in the current wash bay area. There appears to be no provision here for a wash bay at all. This is not acceptable or workable. If the realignment must take place, provision must be made for a separate wash bay and turning bay.	Noted. Refer response to Issues 55 & 57.	Y	1a	124, 125

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
60	The proposed realignment has the effect of swapping 3 trailer parking spaces, a wash bay and a second ramp area access point for "open space". Surely there is already enough "open space" in the area. Trailer parking and access needs to be increased, not reduced, at this regional boating facility.	Noted. Refer response to Issues 55 & 57.	Y	1a	124/5
61	I wish to register my, and that of my family's, objection to any changes to road or directional closures	Noted. Refer response to Issues 55 & 57.	Y	1a	124/5
	RETAIN (OR INCREASE) THE AMOUNT OF BOAT TRAILER PARKING SPACES				
62	Strong objections to the proposal to decrease the number of boat trailer parking spaces were received from 36 individuals as well as groups including the AFA and the BOA. The following comments clarify the reasons for the objections.	<p>The possibility of using some boat parking for general parking during peak times is discussed in Section 3.6.3 of the draft PoM/Masterplan, however, it is assessed as unlikely to be effective or efficient and is thus not included in the Implementation section of the document (Section 5.0).</p> <p>Similarly, the Travel Plan's proposal to convert boat trailer parking into bus parking is also not included. The current configuration of Brothers Avenue and associated car parking arrangements will remain due to the marked lack of support in submissions for changing them. That is, Masterplan Option 1 (with current alignment of Brothers Ave and foreshore car parking) is the clearly preferred Masterplan Option. The following Key Recommendation will be removed from Masterplan Option 1: 'Explore general car use of trailer parking that straddles grass for high sports use periods.</p> <p>The PoM/Masterplan will be amended to clarify that proposals to reduce the amount of boat trailer parking spaces will not be pursued.</p>	Y	1a	75, 83, 124 & 125

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
63	Numerous submissions noted that the amount of boat trailer parking spaces at Tunks Park is already inadequate, and that any Council proposal to reduce the amount of boat trailer parking is totally unacceptable. Submitters stated that Council should be looking to provide more and not fewer spaces. They pointed out particular problem times are in summer, and during late morning/midday.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 62.	Y	1a	75, 83, 124 & 125
64	<i>'Boat ramp facilities are not of much use to anyone if there is nowhere to park the car and trailer nearby'</i> . The Tunks Park ramp is of regional importance to the boating community, and any new Plan of Management must respect this reality.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 62.	Y	1a	75, 83, 124 & 125
65	According to the RMS, boat registrations are increasing every year, so reducing boat trailer parking will make it harder for boaters attempting to access the Harbour. RMS recommend that 25 to 30 spaces be provided per boat ramp lane. Tunks Park has 3 lanes, and currently only 29 boat trailer spaces plus additional off ramp parking spots.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 62.	Y	1a	75, 83, 124 & 125
66	The BOA notes the loss of 3 spaces for the realignment and 2 spaces for buses would equate to a 17% cut to trailer parking at Tunks and would not be consistent with the council's obligation to maintain this as a regional facility. It is also unfair given council's own research shows boat trailers are not the cause of the parking problems, rather it is the volume of people using the sports fields at peak times.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 62.	Y	1a	75, 83, 124 & 125
67	8 submissions noted that reducing boat trailer parking spaces would drive trailers further up into the surrounding streets.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 62.	Y	1a	75, 83, 124 & 125

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
68	The BOA notes that boaters have no alternative but to use Tunks Park and they require off -street parking spaces to do so. (Lavender Bay has no trailer parking so is only useful to people with roof -mounted, water craft such as kayaks). The BOA proposes the council provides more, not less access to the waterways in the LGA to meet the needs of the boating community and to ease pressures at Tunks Park, as recommended over many years (Foreshore Access Strategy 2007 and Water-Based Recreation Needs Study 2006).	Noted. Refer response to Issue 62.	Y	1a	75, 83, 124 & 125
69	8 submissions specifically stated that although the parking spaces for boaters are clearly marked, these spaces are regularly occupied with cars using the Park for other purposes, with little regard for boaters with trailers, or for Council parking restrictions. Many submitters believed that Council should enforce the existing parking restrictions in Tunks Park, stating that they had called Council Rangers on numerous occasions. The BOA notes that there is a high level of concern among ramp users about the impact of cars parking in trailer spots during peak times which is not recognised in the draft PoM.	Although existing signs showing parking restrictions appear to be clear and well-placed, better enforcement (in the form of increased Ranger patrols) is needed. (Several submissions included photos of cars parked in boat trailer parking spaces, with signage prohibiting this clearly visible). The PoM/Masterplan will be amended to better acknowledge this situation. Increased enforcement in the future will particularly focus on peak times such as Saturday mornings, when visitation levels (both for the sportsfields and the boat ramp) are highest.	Y	1a	83
70	Due to increasing demand and the absence of any alternatives on the entire north side of Sydney Harbour, the facility at Tunks Park should be expanded with additional trailer parking and wash bays. Any reduction in parking will reduce the ramp's ability to remain a regional facility. There is ample room in the precinct to create additional parking for everyone.	Noted. No changes will be made to the current level of car and boat trailer parking spaces, or to the configuration of the car parking facilities.	N	2e	83
71	Several submissions suggested that it was appropriate to provide additional car and trailer parking for both water users and park users; <i>'the current park is very large with a number of ovals, park facilities, playgrounds, walking tracks etc – there is no reason whatsoever to reduce the number of parking spaces to create more open space'</i>	Noted. No changes will be made to the current level of car and boat trailer parking spaces, or to the configuration of the car parking facilities.	N	2e	83

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
72	BP&STP support the conversion of boat trailer parking spaces into bus parking.	This is proposed in the 'Tunks Park Travel Plan', however it is not included as a recommendation in the draft PoM/ Masterplan. Submissions from the boating community clearly show that any reduction of boat trailer spaces is inconsistent with community need and the boat ramp's function as a regionally significant facility. Note that the Action in the implementation section of the draft PoM/Masterplan: <i>'Investigate the feasibility of providing drop-off and pick-up bays for general vehicles that can also be used by buses during the week (school groups)'</i> relates to Brothers Avenue. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2e	107
	PARKING FEES				
73	Over 30 submissions (including submissions from the AFA and the BOA) raised strong objections to the proposal to introduce fees for parking at Tunks Park. The following comments summarise the main objections	With regard to the Objective 'Reduce sports parking demands and encourage other modes of transport', one of the Actions in the draft PoM/Masterplan states: <i>'investigate further... priced parking for cars to car park and adjoining streets'</i> . Submissions received in response to the public exhibition of the draft PoM/Masterplan strongly oppose this, citing a range of reasons including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Boat owners have few other options, particularly on the north side of the harbour - Many other boat ramps in Sydney offer free parking - Other park users can arrive via other modes of transport (walk, cycle, shuttle bus), boaties cannot - This would exacerbate street parking by boat trailers in the surrounding area The draft PoM/Masterplan will be amended to remove paid parking from consideration at this time, while other options for reducing reliance on private cars, particularly to access the sportsfields, are pursued.	Y	1a	109, 110

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
74	Several submissions commented that boaties already pay enough in fees and should not have to pay for timed parking. Fees for boat registration, licence fees, fishing licence fees and insurance are supposed to provide equitable use of boating facilities. <i>'Would make a day on the harbour super-expensive, especially for boaties coming from further afield. It is already expensive to get to that ramp due to tolls and fuel, not to mention we stop and buy bait and all necessary items from local shops around the area'.</i>	Noted. Refer response to Issue 73.	Y	1a	109, 110
75	Several submissions stated that charging for parking is just revenue raising, and they expressed disappointment that Council is <i>'trying to make more money from the beautiful natural resource'</i> (Sydney harbour).	Noted. Refer response to Issue 73.	Y	1a	109, 110
76	A number of submissions opposed the introduction of paid parking for boat trailers on the basis that boat owners are valid users of the Park, of equal importance to other stakeholder groups. The BOA notes that: <i>'Boaters have NO ALTERNATIVE in the LGA and cannot take public transport to the area like users of the sports fields, as trailer parking is a requirement of ramp use. This sounds like a money -grab from boaters and will do nothing to resolve the underlying parking issues'.</i>	Noted. Refer response to Issue 73.	Y	1a	109, 110
77	Several submissions were opposed to paid parking on the basis that it is inconsistent with other ramps in the Sydney area (the southern suburbs still have toll free boat ramps)	Noted. Refer response to Issue 73.	Y	1a	109, 110
78	Several submissions noted that introducing paid parking will not have the desired effect (easing congestion), because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - much of the congestion is due to people using the sports fields - boat owners have nowhere else to go; Sydney Harbour has very few launching facilities, particularly on the north side - it will exacerbate street parking (by boat trailers) in the area 	Noted. Refer response to Issue 73.	Y	1a	109, 110
79	3 submissions stated that they were prepared to pay for parking if Council provided improved facilities (including public toilets close to the boat ramp). The submissions supported excluding Council residents from paid parking, and supported reinvesting revenue raised into the Park. One submission stated that if paid parking were introduced, it should apply equally to boat trailers and general parking so as not to be seen as targeting the boating community.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 73.	N	2g	109, 110

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
	BOAT TRAILER PARKING & CIRCULATION				
80	The (proposed) design does not allow for effective parking of boat trailers and flow of boat traffic in and out of the ramp.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 55.	Y	1a	124/5
81	Boats need space to move and turn, closing one access point is dangerous and a crazy idea	Noted. Refer response to Issue 55.	Y	1a	124/5
82	Parking for trailers is also very difficult, given their length.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 55.	Y	1a	124/5
83	The (proposed) realignment of Brothers Ave is not advisable as it reduces the easy access for boaters to the boat ramp.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 55.	Y	1a	124/5
84	If you close the northern entry to the boat ramp it is effectively locking out boaters. This would be a travesty	Noted. Refer response to Issue 55.	Y	1a	124/5
85	Discuss with RMS the use of more “better boating” program funding to increase the size of the floating pontoon wharf. This way more cars can be moving in and out of parking and people can get out of each other’s way quicker.	Increasing the size of the floating pontoon wharf is beyond the scope of this project. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2a	NA

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
	PROPOSED 6-HOUR LIMIT ON BOAT TRAILER PARKING				
86	Strong objections to the proposal to limit boat trailer parking to 6 hours a day were received from 31 individuals as well as groups including the AFA and the BOA. The following comments summarise the main objections.	Submissions opposing this proposal stated that it is not practical and that it indicated a lack of understanding of the needs of the boating community and of how they use the Park and the boat ramp. They stated that the use of boats is not a short-term, scheduled event. Many people go boating for the entire day, and many stay out overnight. The PoM/Masterplan will therefore be amended to remove the proposed 6 hour-a-day limit from boat trailer parking. However, it is important to ensure that these spaces are not occupied for excessively long period by boat trailers (eg for weeks at a time), and further investigations, including consultation with the boating community, will be undertaken to establish more reasonable and workable time limits.	Y	1a	83
87	The proposal for timed parking does not take into account that many users require long period parking. The use of boats is not a short-scheduled event (like a sporting fixture). Most people go boating for the whole day, some stay out overnight. People will have to limit their time on the water. This is not relaxing; Council's should not control how boaties enjoy their pastime.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 86.	Y	1a	83
88	For those launching a boat, or a tender to access a boat, 6 hours is not long enough. Nor is it feasible to park somewhere else, due to the needs to carry equipment and supplies.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 86.	Y	1a	83
89	Imagine the chaos at midday, when the sports fields are busiest in winter, when all the early-launchers return (at the end of a 6-hour parking limit). Will there be allowances made if poor weather, unfavourable tides, engine trouble or a desire not to be caught in peak-hour traffic slows their return?	Noted. Refer response to Issue 86.	Y	1a	83
90	Many boaters stay on the water much longer than the 6hrs parking limit to avoid towing a boat in traffic at peak hour.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 86.	Y	1a	83
91	Consider a "Moored Boat Owners" sticker, renewable every year to differentiate these users on the weekend, allowing them to park for longer.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 86.	Y	1a	83

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
	CAR PARKING				
92	Several submissions oppose the idea of a multi-story car park	The idea of a multi-story car park was considered at the concept options stage but was not pursued due to factors including cost effectiveness, potential visual impact, impact on the character of the Park and spatial considerations. It is not included in the Implementation section of the draft document. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2f	84
94	Suggest council paint markings on roadway to clearly delineate areas where cars and trailers may park and where they must not park so as to not impede on local residents' access and egress to their driveways during peak periods. Suggest enforcement of these markings by council rangers.	This is consistent with proposals already contained in the Implementation section of the document. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2d	109
95	Motorcyclists currently take up one car space each – consider a designated motorcycle parking area.	The draft PoM/Masterplan will be amended to include the Action: 'Investigate need for motorcycle parking at Tunks Park'. If a need is identified, consider how this can be incorporated into the current car park layout.	Y	1a	NA
96	During summer it's the cricket players that are causing the greatest parking issues. Cricket players need to pool their cars, not single families. Perhaps a cricket carpool with limited allocated car spots might work.	The draft PoM/Masterplan advocates development of a Transport Access Guide for Tunks Park as a means of educating the community, including sports clubs, and promoting walking, cycling, car-pooling and public transport use' No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2b	NA
97	PEDESTRIAN & CYCLIST ACCESS & CIRCULATION				
98	BP&STP strongly agree with strategies set out in the draft PoM for pedestrian access, proposed path links and upgrades.	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2d	106/7
99	BP&STP strongly agree that local streets generally: <i>'have narrow footpath walkways and the steep valley gradients to surrounding streets discourages walking for those less mobile and fit pedestrians'</i> .	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2d	109
100	2 submissions noted that certain parts of the asphalt path on the south side of the playing fields flood in wet weather and this needs to be addressed.	The draft PoM/Masterplan will be amended to address the existing problems with this path.	Y	1a	NA

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
101	1 submission suggests that continuing this path around the sportsfields would ease congestion on the path when the sports fields are in full use.	Construction of a path on the northern side of the sportsfields is shown in the Masterplan drawings.	N	2b	124
102	1 submission notes that encouraging cyclist visitation is likely to increase the number of cyclists riding on the already busy pedestrian path through the Park, potentially creating conflict with current users, and that encouraging cyclists to negotiate nearby streets could endanger them, particularly at peak periods.	The draft PoM/Masterplan acknowledges there are challenges to address regarding cycling in and around Tunks Park. It suggests that these challenges would be addressed during development of the Transport Access Guide for the Park. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2b	95, 107
103	BP&STP strongly agree that the steep gradients of local streets, along with their narrow width, busyness and the volume of parked cars, discourages recreational cyclists at times such as Saturday mornings.	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2d	107
	SPORTSFIELDS				
104	1 submission stated that the Plan should include at least one artificial field as the playing surface (with the exception of the main oval) is poor and can be dangerous.	At its meeting of 20 November 2017, Council resolved to proceed with a Plan of Management that excludes floodlighting and artificial turf from Tunks Park. No change to the PoM/Masterplan.	N	2g	NA
105	BP&STP strongly supports Council's resolution: ' <i>not to consider sportsfield lighting at Tunks Park</i> '.	Noted. No change to the PoM/Masterplan.	N	2d	NA
	WINTER USE OF SPORTSFIELDS				
106	2 submissions, including 1 from BP&STP note that Council's reorganisation and rescheduling of Saturday sporting activities during the peak winter period is appreciated, and has made a definite difference in alleviating traffic congestion in and around the Park.	Noted. No change to the PoM/Masterplan.	N	2d	71
107	The BOA supports further staggering the use of the sports field to reschedule some matches to Saturday afternoon and Sunday to ease pressure on peak winter Saturday mornings.	The draft PoM notes that Council will continue to monitor opportunities to fine tune scheduling to reduce peak demands for parking and traffic. No change to the PoM/Masterplan.	N	2b	71
108	3 submissions suggested Council should investigate other options (to Tunks Park) as a location for organised (winter) sport.	The draft PoM notes that this is not currently an option as neighbouring sportsfields are at capacity. No change to the PoM/Masterplan.	N	2e	71

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
	SUMMER USE OF SPORTSFIELDS				
109	<p>Cricket has a significant presence in the North Sydney LGA and participation levels, particularly for women, are growing. There is a corresponding demand for well-planned and designed cricket facilities in North Sydney (there are only 5 nets in the whole LGA), which the draft Masterplan could help address. Tunks Park is an important community facility that host local cricket events, and although it is well-placed to provide additional cricket nets, and although North Sydney District Junior Cricket Club (NSDJCC) has participated in the consultation process, this opportunity has not been addressed in the draft PoM/Masterplan.</p> <p>Both Cricket NSW and NSDJCC note that the PoM process has been unable to determine an acceptable location for nets in Tunks Park. They would like to work with Council and other stakeholders to resolve the following issues, so that cricket nets could be considered for inclusion in the PoM/Masterplan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resident concern about noise (we note that noise generated from a few practice nets is less than that generated by Saturday-morning soccer and is no different to many other low-impact casual uses (eg children's play area). <i>Response: Nets are not intensively used, for long periods of time, and they are not used at night.</i> - Provision of adequate run-up length <i>Response: We consider this easily managed, in a manner of many other cricket grounds in Sydney</i> - Distance from parking <i>Response: the cricket community does not consider this to be an issue, and would greatly prefer to have nets located towards the western end of the park than to have no nets at all</i> - Impacts of fencing on circulation 	<p>Initially proposed for investigation by Council staff, provision cricket nets at Tunks Park was strongly opposed by a large section of the community. Investigations by the consultants into potential locations for nets at the concept options stage of this project failed to determine a location that was satisfactory and acceptable.</p> <p>No change to PoM/Masterplan.</p>	N	2e	71

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
110	Constructing a picket fence would prevent people wandering on to the main oval when cricket is taking place. This would improve safety and mitigate the risk of serious injury (people/dogs being struck by cricket balls). A well-designed fence would not have a negative impact on visual amenity	Construction of a picket fence around the main sportsfield at Tunks Park was considered during the concept options stage of this project. It was considered not feasible or desirable for reasons relating to the aesthetics of the parkland and the need to retain the 'visual sweep' of the green swathe, as well as its impact on circulation within the Park. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2e	NA
111	Is it feasible to provide dark coloured cricket practice nets which would blend in with the surroundings (3.5.2)? They are made of metal and could be easily spray painted.	Refer to response to Issue 109. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2e	NA
112	BP&STP strongly support the draft PoM statement that: The PoM process has been unable to determine an acceptable location due to the following issues: Resident concern about noise, Provision of run-in, Distance from parking, Impact of fencing on circulation'.	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan	N	2d	71
	FORESHORE ENHANCEMENT				
113	Submissions that addressed the issue of foreshore enhancement generally agreed that while small scale upgrading and improvement works were desirable, larger scale works that turned the area into a 'destination' or 'focal point' were undesirable. The following comments summarise the main concerns.	The draft PoM/Masterplan will be amended to limit foreshore upgrading work to smaller scale projects including seats, bike racks and kayak storage and upgrading BBQ and picnic facilities and exercise equipment.	Y	1a	72, 73
114	Several submissions state that while improving the foreshore area is a good idea in theory, in reality, the proposed changes (children's play area, picnic facilities, bike racks, kayak racks, fitness stations, decking and access to water) are likely to have some negative impacts on this relatively small area. Improved facilities will attract more/new users, most of whom will come by car, adding to vehicular congestion problems and traffic and parking issues. Overuse and overcrowding would detract from the (current) beauty and tranquillity of the waterfront and turn this small section into the focal point, instead of encouraging the spread of people throughout the Park.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 113.	Y	1a	72, 73

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
115	Suggest improvements are on a more modest scale: upgrade the existing BBQ area, add some shorter trees (that have minimal impact on views) or shrubs for shade.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 113.	Y	1a	72, 73
116	BP&STP do not support increased use of Tunks Park, stating that this will generate more traffic which is highly undesirable: <i>'increased usage of the park means increased traffic, and it is unrealistic to force more traffic of any kind onto the access roads'</i>	Noted. Refer response to Issue 113.	Y	1a	72, 73
117	The BOA suggests that there is already sufficient foreshore open space for informal recreational use, and the foreshore area should not be expanded at the expense of facilities such as parking, turning areas and washing areas at this regionally significant and state-funded boat ramp. The BOA proposes instead that some of the abundant open space that already exists in the area should be used to create more parking for everyone including ramp users.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 113.	Y	1a	72, 73
118	Propose that the gym area /play area be moved and this area can be utilised to park cars without trailers. There is also the potential to remove grassed area from the entry of Brothers Ave to increase car spots for oval use.	Noted. submissions strongly favored retaining existing circulation system and parking layout due to problems the proposed new arrangements may create. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2a	NA
119	One submission suggests that money spent on the proposed foreshore improvements would be better spent helping to drought-proof the park (as per a previous proposal to install a water tank/viewing platform) in the south-eastern corner of the Park, close to the vehicular entrance off Brothers Avenue.	A water harvesting system currently operates in Tunks Park. The draft PoM/Masterplan includes an Action to investigate the feasibility of providing more water storage through the harvesting system. Note that if this was to occur, the tanks would be 'hidden'. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2b	103
120	Several submissions support creating a separate access point to the water for kayakers to the south of the ramp (in the form of stone steps leading into the water), along with a separate tap and wash area on the grass, and appropriate signage. This would enhance ramp efficiency and stop conflicts over access to the washing area between boaters and other ramp users who do not necessarily need to park a trailer in the washing bay. <i>'This would also provide something for kayak users in the absence of any other proposal for the benefit of this growing cohort of visitors'</i> .	The draft PoM/Masterplan does not suggest creating a separate water access point for kayakers, however it does support provision of kayak racks in the foreshore area to improve facilities for kayakers, and to prevent clutter on the foreshore. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2a	85

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
121	One submissions states that any foreshore decking should be gently curved in design, stepped so as to follow the natural curve of the bay and be less intrusive on sight line from foreshore out to the water. Any decking or jetty should not extend too far out into the bay and intrude on natural outlook. The boat ramp is already a substantial structure projecting into the bay.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 113. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2a	114
122	Instead of hiding the storm water pipes try installing a cage or netting to capture rubbish and leave it visible so the public can see council is proactive at reducing pollution	Noted. Refer response to Issue 113. Proposal is outside the scope of the PoM but will be forwarded to relevant Council sustainability and water management officers for their consideration. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2a	72
	VEGETATION/ENVIRONMENT				
123	A number of submissions are very supportive of the Action to review existing foreshore planting in the Park with the aim of selectively removing some vegetation. Support is given for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The need to provide and maintain views out of the Park to the water, and from the water into the Park - The need to provide more 'sunny spots' for people using the foreshore area for informal recreation, particularly in winter 	Noted. The Implementation section of the draft PoM/Masterplan states that foreshore planting will be reviewed. (Note that when this Action is implemented, interested community members and other stakeholders will be invited to meet with Council staff in the Park, to ensure an acceptable outcome for all). No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2d	100
124	BP&STP note the importance of North Sydney's foreshore parks as viewing points, and state that: ' <i>Existing plantings need to be reviewed. Future plantings should be selected with care, particularly relating to height of growth</i> '.	Noted. Refer response to Issue 123.	N	2c	100
125	Several submissions disagree with the draft PoM's contention that there is insufficient canopy in the Park, noting that many canopy trees are still maturing, the sides of the Park are heavily forested, and that by their very nature, sporting fields must remain open. Further canopy planting will create problems including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deteriorating grass quality throughout the park, especially in winter - Insufficient sunshine for sporting groups and onlookers during peak winter sports period - Insufficient sunshine and impeded views in and out of the park for passive recreation users - Further loss of water views for residents 	Refer response to Issue 123. Council acknowledges that plantings around sportsfields have the potential to negatively impact on turf growth and condition; any such planting would only be undertaken if sanctioned by Council's green keepers. Maintaining the characteristic 'green swath' of turf is also of high importance. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2c	69

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
126	BP&STP strongly support strategies set out in the draft PoM relating to provision of shade and tree canopy through the maintained grass areas to provide tree canopy continuity through the park, connect the bushland slopes visually and provide a degree on aerial habitat connection.	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2c	69
127	BP&STP strongly agree with the draft PoM that: <i>'All new plantings in Tunks Park should be appropriate and sympathetic to the desired landscape character of each section of the Park, whether it is bushland or the more structured planting associated with the playing fields and Park buildings'</i> .	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2c	69
128	One submission notes that if the proposed realignment of Brothers Avenue and car park relocation do not go ahead, then the northern side of the cricket oval currently containing exercise equipment and memorial trees could possibly be expanded and planted out with high canopy trees and shrubs.	The potential for additional vegetation in this area will be assessed when the foreshore planting is reviewed. Refer Issue 123.	Y	1a	NA
129	Suggest more tree planting required along the outer (southern) edge of the 3m wide asphalt path on the south side of the park to provide shade for walkers and respite for sports players during the hot summers	Playing fields abut this path for much of its length. Additional tree planting is not feasible as full sun is necessary for maintaining turf sportsfields in optimum condition. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2e	NA
130	BP&STP strongly support Tunks Park's role in protecting Sydney's natural flora and fauna, noting that: <i>'Protection of fauna and floodlighting (to enable sport at night) are mutually exclusive – there can be no protection of fauna if the park is floodlit'</i> . They strongly support the draft PoM's identification of Tunks Park as a wildlife corridor and as the most important reserve for birds in North Sydney.	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2d	21

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
131	<p>Fisheries supports the proposal to partially 'day-light' the piped creek line to encourage natural habitat regeneration and provide a focal point for community interaction and aesthetic value. If the 'day-lighting' of the piped creek is not feasible for economic reasons, Fisheries recommends improving the aquatic habitat of the currently open creek to create a natural filtration system that improves water quality. A natural filtration system of reeds and aquatic vegetation would assist in stripping silt from the water column before it reaches the culverts and reduce sediment deposition at the culvert outfalls.</p> <p>Fisheries encourages the restoration of native vegetation along Flat Rock Creek (Action 1.9) and the introduction of native vegetation to the harbour foreshore (Action 1.12).</p> <p>Please note DPI's Policy 4.3.1 for managing weirs and dams: '<i>weirs that are no longer providing significant benefits to the owner or user shall be removed</i>'. Please consider whether the weir is still providing significant benefit to Council. Consider installing snags (fallen trees, including the root ball) in the creek to slow flow and create aquatic habitat instead of the weir.</p> <p>If the weir is to remain in place, the fish by-pass needs to be addressed. The purpose of a fish by-pass is to facilitate fish passage. Regardless of its terrestrial habitat value, the fish by-pass must remain fit for purpose. Permanent access ways (e.g. terracotta pipes) should be provided at various depths to ensure fish passage is facilitated at all water levels and flow conditions. Please refer DPI Fisheries 'Why do fish need to cross the road' and Section 4.3 of the DPI Policies and Guidelines for Fish Habitat Conservation and Management which provide information on improving fish passage.</p>	<p>The draft PoM/Masterplan considers the issue of partially 'day-lighting' the creek line, but determines it is not feasible as the extremely high cost outweighs the perceived benefits.</p> <p>Support for various strategies in the draft PoM/Masterplan is noted, and other recommendations will be considered by Council's Bushland Management officers. Future implementation would be part of bushland management works in the Park.</p> <p>No change to PoM/Masterplan.</p>	N	2g	66

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
	PARK USE & FACILITIES				
132	The BOA notes that no mention is made of the boat ramp or its vital importance to Sydney's boating infrastructure in the draft PoM section 'Park Use (2.8, p. 57). <i>'Boating should be recognised as a legitimate park activity alongside dog - walking etc'.</i>	Noted. The PoM/Masterplan will be amended accordingly.	Y	1a	57
133	Several submissions, including one from BP&STP, noted a high level of satisfaction with the park as it currently exists. This is reflected in comments such as: <i>'There is a great atmosphere on a summer day; cricket, family get-togethers and fishos cleaning their catch - all at the same location – it is the true Australian lifestyle'.</i>	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2c	NA
134	Modern changing facilities are needed to support the sportsfields. At least 2 changing rooms per field are required, with toilets and showers. (Blackman Park is Lane Cove is a good model)	The intensity of use at Tunks Park is much less than at Blackman Park, which is a regional facility with several synthetic fields as well as turf sportsfields and a basketball court. Therefore, a comparable level of ancillary facilities is neither desirable nor justified. Council's newly prepared 10-year Asset Condition Report sets out maintenance and upgrading work required to ancillary facilities in Tunks Park. The findings of this audit Report have been incorporated into the draft PoM/Masterplan. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2e	NA
135	A 24hr toilet block is needed near the boat ramp	This was considered by the draft PoM/Masterplan, however was not recommended in the short term. The Implementation Plan suggests reviewing potential for a compact toilet if the proposed foreshore development occurs, however much of this development is not supported by submissions on the draft PoM/Masterplan. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2b	112
136	Council recently completed an access audit of Tunks Park. Recommended works to improve access for all can be incorporated into the Plan of Management	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2b	NA

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
	OTHER COMMENTS				
137	Minimise the amount of unnecessary signage that is proliferating in the area.	Noted. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2c	NA
138	Please keep Tunks Park as an off-leash dog park – the park is an important shared community asset	The draft PoM/Masterplan does not propose to change the status of Tunks Park regarding dogs. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2c	NA
139	Exercise equipment is not mentioned in either Option 1 or 2. New exercise equipment should be reinstalled in a position to maximise use by the public as a part of both options.	The draft PoM/Masterplan notes that fitness (exercise) equipment is to be integrated into the extended foreshore open space zone with further nodes within the main park considered. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2b	73, 85, 113
140	Page 44: '2.6.2 Eastern Park: The eastern park is the parkland area immediately east of Brothers Avenue'. The above description of the area Eastern Park seems to be incorrect and should read: the parkland area immediately west of Brothers Avenue.	Noted. PoM/Masterplan will be amended accordingly.	Y	1e	44
141	BP&STP believe that Plans evolve from a vision, and it is essential to develop a vision for Tunks Park that will support, reinforce and protect this jewel into the future. Note that most of the constraints and opportunities identified in the planning process derive directly from extraordinary physical setting of the Park. "Tunks Park: A Vision" encapsulates the views of our communities: A place of natural beauty: forest and wildlife setting A rare place on Middle Harbour where people can come into contact with the harbour A highly flexible place with a great variety of uses and users A strong and distinctive link in Sydney's Green Grid and Blue Grid A visual environment where almost every surface is plants (trees & grass) A place in Sydney where night is dark A place that is "everybody's backyard" Celebrate this special place where saltwater and freshwater meet!	Noted. No changed to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2c	NA

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
	CONSULTATION PROCESS				
142	<p>10 submissions, including the BOA, BIA and the AFA, are critical of the public consultation process undertaken as part of this project. The submissions state that because the highest levels of participation came from local residents, it is primarily their views that the draft PoM reflects, and that the needs and concerns of other, less vocal, user groups have not been adequately considered. They believe that the PoM should accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders.</p> <p>Several submissions state that local boat users were not included in consultation to same extent as other stakeholders, resulting in a possibly biased consultation affecting the proposed outcome of the plan.</p> <p>Organisations whose members use the boat ramp including the BOA, BIA and the AFA state that until recently they were unaware that a draft PoM was being prepared for the Park, and that their feedback should have been actively sought.</p> <p><i>'I am at a loss as to why council has not sought to place signage at the Park for users (of the boat ramp) to be made aware of the proposed changes/restrictions in order to gain full participation in the consultation process'?</i></p> <p><i>'It is clear from the PoM and the public outreach efforts so far that the council is not interested in the views of ramp users and has put little to no thought into how the boat ramp functions as a regional boating facility'.</i></p> <p><i>'The draft PoM states: 'Many community members contest the amount of parking space and noise allowance that is given to boat and trailer users. This is particularly an issue for residents who hear noise very early in the morning and for sports ground users who do not have access to valuable parking spots during peak times on the weekend.' None of the concerns from the boating community as stakeholders (whether intentional or unintentional) have been sought or listed on this page to provide a balanced view'.</i></p> <p><i>'Investigating more logical options that could benefit a variety of stakeholders of the park, while also trying to reduce the disturbance to local residents that have moved in beside an established regional boat ramp would seem to be a more inclusive and democratic process'.</i></p> <p>The BOA notes that an anti-boating attitude is the inevitable consequence of public consultation which excluded the boating community.</p>	<p>The boating and fishing communities have responded strongly to the public exhibition of the draft PoM/ Masterplan for Tunks Park. A significant amount of well-thought-out feedback was received from organisations and individuals involved in water-based recreational activities centered around the Tunks Park boat ramp and its operational requirements. This feedback has provided Council with the information needed to ensure that the final PoM/Masterplan more accurately reflects the wants and needs of all stakeholders, including the boating community.</p> <p>Proposed amendments to the PoM/Masterplan as a result of feedback received from the boating community are documented elsewhere in this Submissions Table, refer in particular to Issues 1, 39, 55, 62, 73 & 86.</p>	Y	1a	NA

Issue	Key Points Raised	Response	Recommend Plan be Amended Y or N	Criteria Code	Plan Page Number
143	BP&STP congratulates Council and the Consultants on the draft plan: <i>'Throughout the planning process, the consultants have given us the opportunity to express our views. Much of what we have advocated has been incorporated into the plan'.</i>	Noted. No change to the PoM/Masterplan.	N	2c	NA
144	Bay Precinct requests representation on the committee chosen to implement the plan.	Noted. Implementation of works and actions included in the final PoM/Masterplan will occur in stages, and timing will be dependent on availability of funding and other priorities across the LGA. No change to the PoM/Masterplan.	N	2c	NA
145	NSDJCC notes that is has participated actively throughout the consultation process for the draft PoM, with the primary objective of persuading Council to make provision for synthetic cricket nets at Tunks Park as part of the draft PoM. <i>'We are very disappointed that this has not resonated with Council to date, particularly given the very limited nets facilities currently available across the North Sydney LGA'.</i>	The opportunity to incorporate cricket nets into the draft PoM/Masterplan was considered at the Concept Options stage of the process. However, not only were cricket nets seen as undesirable by other park users, but the Consultants were unable to determine a satisfactory location in the Park for nets. No change to PoM/Masterplan.	N	2e	NA

Draft Plan of Management (PoM) / Masterplan for Tunks Park

Attachment 2: Submissions received during public exhibition period

	Comments
1	I am opposed to the removal of boat parking spaces as there is only limited parking already in this area. I am a keen boater and use this ramp regularly. There are only limited ramps on the harbour already so don't make it worse. It will push boat trailers into neighbouring streets. The boat ramp was upgraded not that many years ago so don't undo their great work. Additionally, the use of locked gates would not work for boat access as many boaties launch before daylight in the mornings and may not return till after dark.
2	We recently completed access audits of ten of Council parks and eight Council buildings. These audits included Tunks Park and outline recommendations to eliminate access barriers and areas of non-compliance.
3	As President of North Sydney District Cricket Club, my comments are focused on the main oval which we use for Sydney Cricket Association fixtures during the summer. My consistent comment with respect to development has been in relation to safety. NSDCC are concerned that casual users of the Park who do not understand cricket place themselves in danger when wandering into the field during play. I have witnessed many dogs being struck by cricket balls and without a proper demarcation it is only a matter of time before a casual user is struck. I have met with the local resident group to voice this concern which was acknowledged. NSDCC encourages council to erect a picket fence to mitigate this risk of serious injury. Fence design in other council areas demonstrate that good design does not impact amenity.
4	Any plan should include at least one artificial football field as the playing surface (with the exception of the main cricket oval) is very poor and at times dangerous. Also, adequate modern changing facilities i.e. at least two changing rooms per football field with toilets and showers. See Blackman Park in Lane Cove for a good model. Any plan that doesn't include these measures will be a failure.
5	Please keep this park as an off-leash dog park. This is an important shared community asset.
6	How about nothing is changed? What is it with governments begging to be voted out of their positions? You ask for licenses fees, taxes, money and support and then you turn around and spit in the community's face! How about investing money into this area rather than rendering it useless as "open space" because your looking to save money.
7	I object to any changes to the parking or the wash down facility at Tunks Park. We need this ramp as it elevates the pressure from Roseville and the car places are already not sufficient maybe the council should think about allocating more places for trailer parking. The wash down facility is important for marine biosecurity - a timer was allocated to stop people using it after hours. You need to have a look at foreshore boat ramp in botany that has free parking and wash down facilities. Lastly there has been some talk about locking people out I can tell you there are more than 65000 boaties that will object to this and lockouts in general. For us that use the boat ramp we respect it - let us use the boat ramp facility with no changes needed. If any monitoring is required by council, they may start having a look at cars parking in trailer spots.
8	I am completely opposed to this idea (charging for trailer parking) and see it purely as revenue raising. Please reconsider your proposal. If you want to know why in detail I am against, please respond and I'll provide you with that.
9	Please don't destroy part of Australian history. This park has been a part of family generations of fishing people and would cripple the family content of the park. Don't let your greed destroy yet another icon
10	This proposal is absolutely absurd and just another of many attacks against boaters. Australia is known for its marine life and waterways. What's the point in being surrounded by ocean if we cannot use it?
11	Need more infrastructure for trailer boats; if a fee is involved how about an annual pass for frequent users?
12	I strongly disagree with restricting access to the boat ramp.

13	I do not support the proposed changes, especially ones affecting boat users.
14	As a recreational boater and fisherman, I am 100% against the proposed restrictions to accessing the boat ramp at Tunks Park. In particular: - closure of ramp between 10pm and 7am - introduction of paid parking limited to 6 hours - removal of taps to prevent wash-down and flushing of engines Recreational boaters contribute significantly to local, state and federal governments via rates, licences, registrations and GST yet are being targeted via parking restrictions, marine park lock outs and reduced facilities! Tunks Park is one of only two ramps surviving the Harbours lower reaches from the Northern Suburbs and is a critical piece of infrastructure. It is completely inappropriate for the local council to attempt to restrict users enjoying this facility.
15	I understand that there is a concern about boat engine noise at some hours. mostly around flushing engines with fresh water. Please just put time-locks on the taps. Do not shut boats out before dawn or for the few times anyone would be coming in late. The harbour is not just decorative, it is something that people engage with, and Tunks Park an area I occasionally revisit having grown up in the area.
16	It is a hideous proposal to lock out boaters from 10pm to 7am. most boaters who fish are on the water after 10pm and way before 7am. and to charge 6hour parking is just a mere cash grab again by the council. Many use this ramp and not just people from the north of Sydney. Why not just build a separate area nearby for buses and leave the ramp alone.
17	The PoM's could include a brief reference to new or innovative activities at the parks being able to be considered in light of existing planning and open space controls and directions – with approval being at the sole discretion of OSES/ NSC This way if someone comes up with a really positive, out of the box proposal we have a pathway to consider it.
18	<p>I do not support the changes within the draft plan that affect the car parking for boat users and use of the PUBLIC boat ramp. This boat ramp is of regional importance to many boat users from the local area and from further afield. I personally have been using the ramp for over 40 years and value its location and free use highly and use the ramp regularly. I also note that it is one of only a small number of boat ramps on the North shore. The proposal to shut the boat ramp between 10pm -7am is total preposterous and further excludes boaters from the limited resources available. Boating use is not run to a timetable. Boaters should be able to have access to the harbour 24/7. Speaking for the fisherman ...most of us leave early to avoid changes to winds and weather. By limiting hours of use it creates a huge safety issue where a boater may have left at a specific time but experiences bad weather, change of circumstance or an emergency and cannot get back to their trailer or have access to or from the water for whatever need. I do not see why we should have to pay to use a PUBLIC boat ramp. The boating community already pay fees for boat registration, licence fees and fishing licence fees that are supposed to provide equitable use of boating facilities. How does this proposal and its considerable limitations meet these needs? The parking spaces for boaters are clearly marked for "boats with trailers". Unfortunately, these spaces are constantly taken up with cars using the park for other purposes, and with little regard for boaters with trailers or Council parking restrictions. Yet we are made out to be the bad guys? I have had to call the rangers on numerous occasions to police this disregard for parking rules just to park my boat in the specified spaces. This then has a knock-on affect pushing cars with trailers out of the ramp area and up the hill. Also, I do not see how it can be fair to put a 6hr time limit on parking spaces. I often go fishing early in the morning and go far out to sea and do not return to later that same day (more than 6 hrs) or even stay out overnight. This again is unfair and pushes local Council control over how we enjoy our pastime on the open water and again...excludes boaters. The current park is very large with a number of ovals, park facilities, playgrounds, walking tracks etc and see no reason whatsoever to reduce the number of parking spaces to create more open space? There are volumes of open space all around the ramp? Again, this is just another way to exclude boaters and take away our facilities that we are paying for. One of the most important facts that is being overlooked is that this boat ramp has a very long history and is an intrinsic part of Cammeray and its Heritage value. Furthermore, NSW Maritime (RMS) have spent a great deal of money over recent years improving the boat ramp for the use of boaters and making it accessible to both disabled and all abilities persons, and Council now propose significant restrictions to the boat ramp and its use this makes no sense at all again?? How is this equitable? Again, excluding boaters and persons with a disability.</p> <p>I totally support the removal of water taps to stop engine flushing. I have always seen this as an issue for local residents due to noise created from engine flushing by inconsiderate boaters. I would suggest that improved signage be placed and restrict the starting of boat motors out of the water totally. This will limit noise issues considerably. I know this proposal is being driven strongly by local residents who feel there should not be a boat ramp as it creates noise but would like to point out there has always been a boat ramp in this location and to my knowledge has been there for over 50 yrs? Residents come and go. The free access to Sydney harbour should not be influenced or restricted by the minority. I think that it is highly unfair to punish & restrict boaters from 24/7 use of the boat ramp and its surrounds. I am more than happy to discuss my submission with Council officers.</p>

19	The design does not allow for effective parking of boat trailers and flow of boat traffic in and out of the ramp. One of the beautiful things about Tunks park is the green and water access. The proposal should be focused on improving both... delivery of a great public space for all. If noise from boat cleaning is an issue. Taking taps away is easy but removing traffic and making life difficult for families wanting to use the waterways isn't the answer and outcome anyone wants.
20	Altering one of the best boat ramps in Sydney, let alone one of the very few in this area, is totally absurd. The main purpose of being near the water is to have access to it. Strongly object to this proposal.
21	I find that further restricting boat parking totally unacceptable. The boats already park in the street and the parking should be shared. Is the council going to build another ramp? These boaters buy food bait petrol etc all from local businesses you want them driven bankrupt. Fishing isn't evil it is the Aussie way of life DONT restrict it and go down the way the liberals will go down.
22	I'm writing in regard to the proposed changes to the Tunks park boat ramp in Cammeray. This is the only boat ramp with trailer parking in North Sydney, hence its importance to local fishermen I'm very concerned about the proposed changes, including the shutting the ramp from 10m to 7 am, charging boaters for weekend trailer parking, sealing off one of the entrances, removing taps to stop engine flushing and most of all changing the existing 29 trailer spaces to 'open spaces'. Surely these changes can't be made. Fishing is a very important pastime for working families, both for leisure and for putting food on the table I hope you make the right decision
23	The NSW Government has raised the ire of the fishing public. Please see the Stop the lockout page on Facebook book. The page has 60,000 plus members. Yes, we need to be responsible and use shared resources wisely. Yes, we should all respect local residents. Yes, if you get between us and our boat ramp expect a vicious backlash. The boat ramp was there before 90 % of residence if not more. If you lock us out before 4 am people will let themselves in. Also keep in mind if people think the nearby residents are to blame some may feel the need to make them aware of their feelings on the matter. Please just be sensible about this.
24	The proposed redevelopment of this boat ramp is a horrendous targeted attack on fisherman. Fisherman will always launch their boat and go out fishing before 7am it is not fair that they are targeted here. Tunks Park boat ramp is the only boat ramp on the Northside of the harbour with adequate trailer parking. There are no areas where trailer parking can spill over to either is there another boat ramp of its like nearby so people are going to be forced to park in tight areas out the front of residents' houses. This is only going to make it worse for the relationship between residents and visitors. People drive from as far as Windsor each week because of the adequate amount of turning room for larger trailer boats.
25	As a boating user, I am against any lockouts to use an existing boat ramp I have been using for many years. As technology has progressed so has the outboard engine it doesn't make noise and blow blue smoke anymore so the noise pollution shouldn't be an issue. If you live next to it - well it wasn't built last week like a main road. As for paying to park your car and trailer that is a joke; it will be cheaper to park around your council chambers and catch a uber to the ramp.
26	The boat ramp at Tunks Park needs to stay open and parking needs to remain free. More space for boat trailers and other non-trailer parking should be expanded. I am a keen kayak fisherman and this park is one of the access points to beautiful North harbour. Please do not spoil it with any plans to reduce the boat ramp traffic or access to parking facilities.
27	I run a fishing charter. I live in Wilberforce just past Windsor. I tow my boat every day to launch at Tunks Park. My day starts at 5am at the ramp. They have proposed a lock out between 10pm - 7am. This would have a massive impact on my business. My clients travel from all over Sydney and from interstate. All that travel from interstate stay in the city and catch cabs to Tunks Park. This would not only just affect me but the money that my clients bring to the surrounding community.

28	<p>As a regular user of the Tunks Park ramp for launching a retrieving my small boat for recreational fishing I want to raise with you the community value it provides not only to the residents of North Sydney but also to the greater boating population of Sydney.</p> <p>The ramp is well located to access Middle and Sydney harbour and provides a safe location for launching in adverse wind conditions that prevent or restrict safe launching at other Harbourside sites.</p> <p>As an older person who generally fishes alone I find that the Tunks Park ramp is the best Sydney Harbour ramp for single-handed launching and boat retrieval. Restrictions to its use will severely affect my ability to enjoy a safe and satisfying recreational activity for a person aged over 60 years of age.</p> <p>I ask that whatever your decisions are regarding the future of Tunks Park and the management of the ramp you consider the impact any restriction on its use will have on the well behaved elderly users of the facility.</p> <p>Thank you for your kind consideration.</p>
29	I live in the North Shore and use the Tunks ramp frequently. I think it's a joke the rich minority can dictate what the rest of us do. I pay boat rego, trailer rego, insurance, fishing fees, boat licence fees. The boat facilities in Sydney are extremely poor at the moment. This would only make things worse.
30	I object the proposal to limit opening hours of ramp. Most fishers are at the boat ramp as early as 6am.
31	<p>I am a resident who owns a trailer boat and lives within 2km of the Tunks Park boat ramp. It seems that the majority in the community are now making life harder for the minority who enjoy trailer boating. There are now parking restrictions everywhere, and NS Council is proposing to further limit boating by limiting usage hours and parking for trailers at Tunks Park. I urge the Council to strongly resist the vocal majority who want to kill off a healthy outdoor sport. I have used the Tunks Park ramp for about 4 decades and it has been an integral part of boating on Middle Harbour and Sydney Harbour. Boating is about spending hours relaxing and enjoying the beautiful Harbour. Limiting parking to 6 hours would simply kill the sport. If I go fishing at sunrise, I will need to be back by noon or get fined. This is not relaxing. I may want to stay out the whole day. 6 hours is severely limiting. Why not 10 or 12 hours? Reducing trailer parking spaces would further drive trailers up the streets into the neighbourhood, not a prospect that I am sure the neighbours would want. Parking for trailers is also very difficult, given their length. Dedicated spaces are required. They also get used, so they are not sitting vacant. There are very few boat ramps on Sydney Harbour and Middle Harbour already. The community wants more access to sporting fields, etc. and are prepared to sacrifice boaters. What about the boaters? There are already very few options remaining to launch a boat in the Harbour. We should be preserving what little facilities we have, not reducing them. The effect of further limiting access to the Harbour would be detrimental. Regarding noise, I try to be courteous when using the ramp, limiting noisy engines, etc. I support measures that reduce noise pollution, but I oppose limiting the hours on ramp usage. Fisherman need to use the ramp before sunrise to get to their fishing spots, and similarly after sunset. Limiting ramp usage would be detrimental to fishers. I urge Council to consider all the users of the facilities, not just the vocal objectors. Please do not take away trailer parking spaces, nor impose overly harsh time restrictions that will be kill the sport.</p>
32	<p>I am against the current proposal to modify Tunks Park and creating a limit on the boat ramp access. This ramp is only 1 of 2 ramps available for access to middle harbour. Tunks parks is the closest ramp to harbour and head lands and provides a safe sheltered place to park and launch and retrieve your vessel. The ramp at Roseville is difficult to access if you do not live on the north side of Sydney. It is difficult to access Roseville when towing a boat if travelling from Sydney's west. If travelling from the west the only other option is wharf road but this incur a 40-50-minute boat ride to the harbour.</p> <p>As an alternative I would suggest placing a ban on flushing motors during night time hours at Tunks parks or possibly banning motor flushing at this venue at all times. This will significantly reduce any loud noise which is more than likely disturbing the local community.</p>
33	I am against this proposal. The amount of boat ramps on and around North Sydney and Sydney in general is very limited as is. Tunks Park being closed in those hours would cause a massive strain on the area as it will be a rush to get there on opening and closing times. Most serious Fishermen and fisherwomen are at the ramp around 4-5am and are quite and considerate. Please don't take away what is one of the reasons I moved into the area for.
34	I'm a fisherman who uses this boat ramp. It's hard enough to find a boat ramp that's not full - don't take this away from us.
35	Ridiculous idea. Leave it as is or make it better for boat owners to enjoy. I use it to access that side of the harbour with my family as it is safer than other ramps and stops us needing to cross dangerous waters. Totally disagree with this lockout
36	I use Tunks Park ramp facility a lot and we need more parking lots and a wash bay. There aren't many ramp facilities this side of the harbour and if this goes it's ridiculous. It's called a harbour for a reason - upgrade this boating facility.

37	This boat ramp and associated infrastructure is the reason I live here. It provides easy access to the harbour for myself and my family. I regularly use the boat ramp very early and am long gone by 3am some days. Limiting the ramp access to daylight hours is not a reasonable solution. Anyone who suggests so doesn't understand the early starts required to get to good fishing areas by first light. It is not heavily used during night hours, and those that do use it are usually the more responsible, highly proficient boat owners. Keep the ramp and infrastructure as it is.
38	I am a regular responsible user of the boat ramp and I would hate to see the recreational fisher community locked out of this ramp. Usually I would launch at 5.30 and be back in by midday. I don't mind paying a fee if the facility is appropriate, i.e. toilets but most serious fishing sessions go for longer than 6 hours - 8 would be more acceptable.
39	Sydney is a harbour city, and continuously making it difficult for people to enjoy the harbour is squeezing Sydney of what makes it Sydney. These redevelopments aren't making any improvements, only catering to a vocal minority who are unable to cope with people who don't align to their ideals, i.e. people who enjoy boats on the harbour.
40	Boat users currently have few options to launch their boat into Middle Harbour. I use this boat ramp 2 or 3 times a year for fishing and social boating activities. Other users of Tunks Park have many options for picnicking, exercising and dog walk in the vicinity yet Boat user have few. Roseville bridge is already full and a lack of Boat ramp and facilities in the Nth Sydney needs to be rectified. I however would be happy to pay for parking but restricting hours is downright daft as boat users like to be on the water before first light. Please take into the account the lifestyle Sydney siders enjoy.
41	<p>I wish to register my, and that of my family's, objection to this proposal of the plan management of Tunks Park oval when it comes to paid parking, Multi use of boat parking area any changes to road or directional closures and time closures. As per the road and maritime recommendation 25 to 30 spaces be provided per boat ramp lane considering the ramp is a three-lane ramp currently there are only 29 spaces provided plus additional off ramp parking spots that we must not lose. Blocking off access and failure to provide adequate car only parking would result in cars occupying car and trailer spaces, which limits the capacity of the ramp facility particularly at sites that also support non-boating user groups not to mention safety issues.</p> <p>I am considerate that the park is heavily pressured for sports however you have to consider that is also a boat ramp that is operational, I have kids and the kids play at Tunks on the weekends usually Saturdays me personally I have no drama parking on match days seeing that games are widely spread out time wise. The only problems I see are those who don't respect the trailer parking.</p> <p>The complaints have stopped when it comes to the water tap being used at late night for after hours' boat flushing with the introduction of the water timer so I would see no need for the proposal for opening times. Removing cleaning facilities at any ramp would pose a risk to marine bio security especially at the cleaning table when dealing with fish. Fishing and boating is a way of life for us we go early or in the evening because the fish feed early and late that's when the best catches are we have no control over fish feeding activity most have four stoke engines that are low on noise and we don't stick around we put in and go minimal noise. I don't condone noise out of hours or flushing at 2am however there are also moorings and marine business in the same area that would provide the same noise level early and late. Residents that are living there were aware that they live next to a park\ramp area and some noise will always be an issue.</p> <p>Allocating paid parking is not a solution especially for weekends or weekdays 6-hour zones or any parking zones are ridiculous considering when it comes to parity the southern suburbs still have toll free boat ramps and park areas. What would this achieve and why limit our weekend activity when we already pay council rates. Hence, I object in the strongest of terms to this the boat ramp suggestions in this proposal and will exercise my democratic right to both protest against it and assist any campaign seeking to unseat any councillor that supports this proposal.</p>
42	Do not change Tunks Park boat ramp.
43	Why can't you people just leave things alone. Just maintain the current amenity and stop trying to ruin everything.
44	As being the only accessible boat ramp and being regarded with great amenities the boat ramp has been invaluable in taking my family fishing every year since 2003 I would personally be devastated if time limits were imposed for trailers and being concerned about obtaining a fine for overstaying. The park should remain the way it is only with the amenities being maintained and upgraded as the years go by.
45	The council have no right taking part of the ramp away from the boaties. The ramp was placed there for everyone to use. If this proposal goes ahead I won't be voting again for this member of council. This is a democratic country and everyone has the right to enjoy our wonderful waterways.
46	Please do not limit times of use for the boat ramp or remove parking. I'm a regular user of the ramp year-round usually arriving before 6am. Boat and trailer parking is at a premium in summer as it is without having spots removed. 6-hour limits are also a joke as many people are out fishing for longer than this period.


47	Tunks Park is the only boat ramp in north Sydney and rather than imposing restrictions on boaters, facilities (number of trailer parking spaces) need to be increased. I understand the issues around noise pollution however closing the boat ramp in the early morning is not the answer. Perhaps look at preventing engine flushing during unsociable hours (turning off water) which would have the desired effect. This is much needed facility for boaters and it is of great concern me that shrinking facilities is even being considered.
48	Please do not reduce or restrict boat and trailer access to Tunks park boat ramp. This is one of only two ramps in all of Middle Harbour. I often go fishing with my sons using the ramp in the early hours of the morning. I can understand not having a tap or wash down bay as this can be done when boat owner gets home. Please, please for the love of god do not restrict the ramp or trailer parking. If anything, expand the carpark.
49	I find this proposal completely out of touch with the local demand and community expectations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Boat ramps require 24 hours of operation. People go fishing early and need to be on the water early, and fish night. The cues waiting for any opening period would jam the local roads 2- Councils should be expanding boating facilities. We have an amazing harbour and boating heritage and this proposal is a disincentive to boating which is an active and wonderful family activity that has proven mental health benefits 3- Boats need space to move and turn, closing one access point is dangerous and a crazy idea 4- My question is WHY, WHY, WHY are you not proposing more parking for trailers??? Sports ovals can be placed in many different positions but there are only 2 boat ramps of any quality on the middle harbour and this proposal would kill this ramp. Please reconsider this proposal and review how you can increase council's contribution to this wonderful past time that connects people with the water
50	The lockout times for the boat ramp will create more congestion.
51	The new plans for the boat ramp at Tunks Park are a disgrace. As someone who had spent a lot of time there, eating and drinking in your local shops after, what an absolute cash grab and slap in the face for boaters. This is another example of the rubbish people have had enough of with politicians and local councils. Your reputational damage is going to be huge across the community for these proposals. Shame on you.
52	Changing the park to the detriment of recreational fisherman is a cop out. Make it usable for all instead of continuing the trend of isolating and ostracising a major part of the community.
53	I use this ramp a lot during all times of the day for my family for fishing. I believe changing the parking and access will impact the community as a whole
54	I use Tunks park boat ramp all the time. I don't support any changes that will take away the boat ramp from the boating community.
55	I think that you need to take into account that the boat ramp is part of Greater Sydney and that the Harbour is not owned by the few millionaires that have houses right on the water. There are hardly any boat ramps as it is. If we launch from Tunks we go offshore and the 6-hour limit is not sufficient as we are away for longer than that. Also, the parking numbers are not sufficient for a boat ramp as it is, they are constantly being filled by soccer mums. If you have ever fished, you will know you need to be on the water by sunrise which can't be done if the ramp is locked at night. If these changes go ahead I will petition the state government.
56	Tunks park is one of 2 boat ramps available on the north side of the harbour for the north shore, the other being Roseville. I live in Tempe and mostly use Rose Bay (which is disgraceful in itself with the lack of parking) being the only ramp with access to the harbour in the eastern suburbs. I quite often take my boat to my gf place in Northbridge and we use the Tunks park ramp a lot now. If anything, this and other ramps should be upgraded for more parking, and if that is not the case then put more ramps in as the access is a joke for a city this size and with its population. I mean I have to get down there at 5.30am just to get a park. Come on councils, pull your heads in and save this ramp.
57	I wish to declare my concern regarding the Tunks park management plan especially regarding timed lockouts of boat ramp, reduced boat trailer parking and potential limited payed parking. the boat ramp allows access to all boat owners and operators within the area. Access to moored boats, fishing folk, emergency services should be available 24/7. People work shift hrs and go fishing or want access to the boat ramp at all times - this should not be restricted. Fisherman fish by the tide etc, having a 7am start just does not make sense. if you restrict trailer parking you will get more trailers trying to park in already congested nearby streets. if anything, trailer parking should be increased. I agree with you that boaters should not be starting up or washing engines out of the water as this noise echoes and this should be signposted as law. Existing taps should be used & placed on timers and not used for flushing engines. I propose that the gym area /play area be moved and this area can be utilized to park cars without trailers there is also the potential to remove grassed area from the entry of Brothers Ave to increase car spots for oval usage. You must reconsider the existing proposal as I feel that the interest of all boaties has been left out. Boaties pay enough already in fees and

	should not have to pay for timed parking or ramp usage. No one goes fishing or boating for 6 hrs (parking limit) most go for the whole day. Stop the lockouts and please keep the area as it is - for the use of boaties and recreation without limits. I will be spreading the proposal everywhere to ensure that the public are aware of the poor judgement on behalf of what has been put forward.
58	I find the proposal outrageous. This is a public space and should be used by all at any time. We boaters are already under resourced with boat ramps around this area. Residents should move if they don't like the noise.
59	I've used Tunks Park for years and it has saved me and hundreds of other boaters/fishers hundreds of dollars annually. It's a great ramp and provides closer access than most other ramps. The proposed changes are unfair to the boating fraternity and will cause greater congestion at other already congested ramps. Tunks Park actually needs to be upgraded to provide more parking not less but by all means remove taps to minimise noise if that's the real issue.
60	I read with dismay some of the proposals by council to alter the boat ramp facilities at Tunks Park. Like anyone who has regard for their possessions, I need to hose salt water off my boat and trailer and flush out my outboard motor after an outing on the water. And like thousands of people on the North Sydney area I live in a unit and have no choice but to park my trailer sailer on the street where there are no taps to use. Me and my fellow unit dwelling trailer boat owners are therefore totally reliant on the tap at Tunks Park for this necessary task, so removing it would be devastating for us.
61	Please don't close Tunks Park Boat Ramp to evening and early morning boaters. I have often launched at 4.30 am to head out fishing.
62	I used to be a frequent user of the Boat Ramp and my son played League at the Park. The ramp is an important harbour access point. Which competes with the soccer during winter months. The only real issue is parking but local boat owners should be entitled to harbour access. Please continue to support boat access.
63	I do not support the 7.30am lockout of the boat ramp at trunks park. It's a ridiculous proposal. Most marine activities require early starts and the undue restrictions on boat owners with added traffic to the area is not justified.
64	Keep the Tunks boat ramp as is.
65	I use Tunks Park boat ramp almost every weekend boating with my kids and mates as it the quickest way to the water for me I never rinse motors or use the ramp inappropriately but adding parking fees would make a day super expensive and un realistic with already so many tolls on the way in and also cutting down parking would only create a problem as boat trailers would be left parked up on the streets.
66	Thanks for your time. I just wanted to say locking up Tunks Park out of hours is a crazy idea. Many people with access to the boat ramp do this between sunset and sunrise. Not only boating people, but also fishing people use this ramp "Out of hours". Also, with a limited amount of boat ramps in the area, the only sensible thing is to increase the amount of boat ramp access, trailer boat parking and access to the ramp for boat users. There are plenty of other places (non-boating) people can go for a walk in the park or to kick a soccer ball. KEEP THE BOAT RAMP A BOAT RAMP.
67	There are very few ramps in the main body of the harbour and they are inadequate for the large number of trailer boat owners already. Tunks Park ramp is already a joke with motorist often taking up parking designated for trailers and the way I see it you are looking to reduce access for boaters even further. Given the need for ramps and the huge monetary value contributed by the boat owning and recreational fishing sector it would be madness to consider a reduction of their facilities. If anything, there needs to be more access for boaters, especially in the eastern suburbs with only one hopelessly inadequate ramp at Rose Bay.
68	If anything, we need to increase parking and facilities at this ramp not the other way around.
69	Having a gate that opens at 7am does not provide boaters the public access to use the ramp at any time! There are no houses down in that area for which boats annoy the neighbors!
70	Locking Tunks boat ramp off until 7.30am will cause major issues for us boat owners. Most boat owners generally launch much earlier than this. Closing it till 7.30am will cause a major over flow to Roseville ramp and cause further issues. Not one boat owner will agree to this proposal. Please consider this.
71	I use the boat ramp for my aquaculture studies, the Tunks boat ramp was there before the new wealthy mansions
72	Seriously can't believe you want to lock the Tunks park boat ramp up. It already costs me so much money to get there from where I live through tolls and fuel, not to mention I stop and buy bait, food, drinks from local shops. You want to charge for car and trailer parking and put a time limit on what time we can put our boats in the water, if the locals aren't happy with the noise than simply don't buy a house near the water! It's like saying I don't want people to drive on my street during the hours of 10pm til 7am it's absolutely ridiculous. That is the safest boat ramp for me to take my son and family out from as you don't have to go out or through middle harbour with the kids. Councils and local government are destroying N.S.W bit by bit and come election time heads will be rolling everywhere. People are sick to

	death of being told what they can and can't do. Do we live in a free country or a dictatorship because you'd have more rights in North Korea than you'll have in NSW soon.
73	I oppose the shutdown of the boat ramp.
74	I recently found out about the possible gating of the Tunks park boat ramp until 7.30am. As a recreational fisherman from western Sydney this ramp gives me great access to the harbour and surrounding waterways and is only an hour from my home. Most of us fisherman leave early and try to get on the water early to start our day, usually about 5am. This would negatively affect me in a massive way and make it extremely hard for me to pursue my favorite hobby. Some species of fish simply can't be targeted after sunrise. I've always respected the ramp and local residents and used bins provided and keep noise to a minimum when I visit and as far as I have seen so do other boaters and fishermen. Please consider my recommendation not to gate this ramp and stop so many hard-working Australian boaters and fishermen enjoying their favorite hobbies.
75	Not open until 730am is a joke come on guys you're only killing the people that really love fishing what's wrong with u guys.
76	Please keep the boat ramp 24hrs, there are so few harbour access points for trailer boats. The ramp is well down the hill away from residents. Manly council has just about wiped out its harbour access with boom gate and legal trailer parking restricted to about 6 parking spots. The harbour is for everyone not just some. Don't be like Manly.
77	This ramp is my go to when fishing the harbour and offshore with my kids. I really don't understand why it's getting locked up!!! Getting our kids outdoors and educating them about the ocean and waterways is a big thing for me. So, don't make it harder make it easier please then adding to it towing a boat during peak hour is dangerous and adds to the over stressed roads
78	Hundreds of people each week, mainly fisherman utilise the ramp at Tunks Park and have done so for many many years. Access to the harbour is a right of every resident of Sydney and should not be limited because of a few residents who are lucky enough to be able to afford to live on our beautiful water way want to close the ramp. People need to access the ramp early morning and night as fisherman work to the tides not the time. If noise is the issue, install cameras and microphones to monitor and fine people who create excessive noise like is done for trucks on many of our roads. Closing Tunks Park will only push more traffic to another ramp and create overcrowding issues.
79	This is ridiculous, you should be doing up the ramp and facilities at Tunks park for the recreational boat users not restricting us. Restricting trailer parking and putting in time limits will surely just create more problems. Thank you. One very unhappy tax paying, rego paying, license paying recreational boat user.
80	This is nonsense! How can businesses who operate fishing charters and general recreational fishermen and even families get out there for morning sunrise bait runs and first light fishing?! This is absurd! This needs to be scrapped!
81	I would like to see a new redesigned car park with 24/7 boat ramp access to better serve the community. I personally would not like to see it locked up, this is a sovereign right for all natural beings to be free to enjoy the water. Thankyou.
82	Please do not limit the opening hours for the boat ramp or place a 6hr limit for parking. Trailer boat access to the harbour is difficult enough without further restriction.
83	Don't close it off, we love going fishing 24 hours a day and don't make any noise or leave any rubbish behind at the ramp.
84	Leave boat ramp open 24 hours. We always use it as a family for early morning fishing trips.
85	Please keep ramp open overnight. Will be too busy at 7.30am and cause major issues if you change the times.
86	Leave boat ramp open overnight, never seen any fishoes cause drama at that time of night. Everyone quietly launches boat and heads out for a day of fishing
87	Don't change the times for the ramp. If you do will cause major congestion at opening time and affect many people wanting to go fishing early or overnight.
88	Friends of mine that live close to the area we meet up at this ramp quite frequently to launch our boats at 5:30 in the morning so we can get a good start to the day and get some really good live bait this is why we launcher 5:30 in the morning before sunrise if you put a gate in front and don't let us launch before 7 a.m. we will not get the best start to the day please take this into consideration thank you.
89	We need to be out before sunrise and no one is noisy down at the ramp pre-7am anyway. Not sure what is trying to be achieved with the times. No other ramps, Roseville will get smashed, boating will become a thing of the past and to think we live on one of the best natural harbours in the world and boating freedom is cut off, it un-Australian.

90	I have read the draft Tunks Park Masterplan and would like to note my strong opposition to proposed action 8.7 regarding any move to prevent the use of the ramp over the 24hr period. This is one of only two boat ramps on the northern side of the harbour that allow recreational fisherman and boat users access to Middle and Sydney Harbour. Recreational fisherman often launch their boats before sunrise (often from 4am onwards) and also return to the ramp late in the evening. Placing a time restriction on the use of this ramp would basically make it unusable for most serious recreational fisherman. If there is a problem with noise from engines being flushed then place a restriction on the washing of boats at the ramp (easy enough to wash the boat at home). There is a serious lack of boat ramp facilities in Sydney and this proposal would basically remove another boat ramp from use. Noise management would be a far more preferable option.
91	My friends and family use these 2 boat ramps to get into middle harbour I do not think it is suitable to close these ramps down and open them at 7.30am because by that time there is always boats in and out it is not fair to put hours down for boat ramps for the people the greenies tried to lockout fisherman it didn't not happen and I warn and urge you not to go ahead with these plans because the strike back will be 10x worse with the protests. Thankyou.
92	As a keen fisherman that uses Tunks park boat ramp I would not like to see a gate put across the boat ramp, this will stop early morning starts out on the water and cause all of congestion at surrounding boat ramps. This needs to be wiped off the plans.
93	I would like to see improvements with car and trailer parking allocating more spaces for both water users and park users. Do not charge for parking. Do not put time limits or locked gates for water/boat ramp users. Please erect 24hr toilet block. The realignment of Brothers Ave is not advisable as it reduces the easy access for boaters to the boat ramp. There needs to be a bus drop off point cut into the park space for safety reasons. A children's park next to the water near the storm water outlets in general is a bad idea it would be better developed into more car/trailer parking and kids park located in the sports park side. Instead of hiding the storm water pipes try installing a cage or netting to capture rubbish and leave it visible so the public can see council is proactive at reducing pollution.
94	Recreational fishermen pay for a fishing license in this state which has absolutely nothing to do with local government councils! So what give you the right to do this? The maritime and DPI always do everything they can to upgrade boat ramps to help the public and you are going to charge people? Get your heads out of your ass! What clown thought this up? I already know that answer! A non-boating/fisherman! You idiots don't realize the fallout of this if you go ahead with it! Fisherman are already talking to solicitors and thinking of taking out a class action against the government over all the marine parks!
95	Please keep open 24 hours
96	No, no to your paid parking. We pay enough money for fishing licenses, taxes, fuel and the list goes on.
97	I think it is ridiculous that the ramp be changed to one lane and boat parking be reduced, as well as having the ramp closed at certain hours. There are only 2 ramps that being Tunks and Roseville servicing the whole of the north shore. First it was boat trailer parking restrictions, then a proposed fishing lockout, now reduced and restricted boat ramps. All part of a bureaucratic ploy to make it impossible for fishers and boaties to enjoy their hobby and relaxation. Why not close down golf courses and cafeterias. Oh no we couldn't do such a thing as these are the past times of the greens and the elite of our society. I thought we were supposed to be living in a free and democratic society, how wrong and misguided we all have been.
98	Please leave Tunks park boat ramp open 24hrs without restrictions as a lot of business and leisure people use the ramp early morning prior to 7am.
99	I am a regular user of Tunks Park boat ramp and think it is a great facility. I feel putting the paid time meters in and the restrictions of usage hours are quite ridiculous. I am from a low-income family and can barely afford to get out fishing, by putting timed parking meters in will definitely push it over the edge to the point I can't go fishing anymore and I'm sure there are a lot of other families out there in the circumstance. Days I do go out fishing I tend to get out early mornings to beat the rat race Sydney is, reducing the hours will simply push people to other boat ramps and make them even busier.
100	This is my main boat ramp that myself and many other friends, family and fishers and recreational boaters use, we like to use this from early hours of the morning so we get the most time on the water and in cooler times for the summer weather.
101	I Would like to express my support against the restricted timings of the launch of boats from Tunks Park. I fish on a regular basis and have also been on a few charters. We usually launch before dawn, so this restriction would affect us. Thanks for your time.
102	I need to use this boat ramp as it is very easy to use for myself and my kids. This boat ramp is the only ramp I use because I only have a little dingy and I only fish near the spot bridge at any time of the days, to use a further boat ramp I would not be able to fish in the spot We usually sit. This would be very inconvenient. Please consider.
103	I use this ramp regularly, both Summer & Winter. The proposal to have gates & reduce trailer parking is a disgrace! Shame on you using these waterways is what I do, you should not be allowed to dictate to me when I can & can't use these waterways!

104	This is absolutely ridiculous. Why would you deprive an area whose prime attraction is water from having a boat ramp? I grew up in Willoughby and still use this ramp weekly, what sense is there requiring me to drive to Roseville to use my boat?
105	Please do not limit ramp hours. Remember you are voted in and lockout to fishers can get you voted out!
106	Use Tunks Park boat ramp regularly and launch around 5am as do many of my friends
107	Please do not impose restrictions on boat and trailer use within the park because it will only lead to added pressure at other boat ramps in Sydney that are already operating under strain from volume.
108	Do not close the boat ramp till 7/30 because of rich people complaining! I work as a school teacher and love fishing before work and educate students about the ecosystem and environmental factors.
109	This proposal is a joke as fisherman like myself are well and truly on the water before 7.30am some blokes make their living putting in at Tunks park from charters to divers etc. this proposal is a joke and needs to be opposed.
110	Please don't go ahead with this. I have visited Tunks Park many times and love the way it is. Yes, it can get a little busy at times but this is plan not the answer. This is basically "Locking is out" from enjoying the harbour. This type of plan/action will only encourage other popular areas/attractions to copy and only then will you realise when it affects you, how much of an impact a decision like this will have on your weekends and life. Please leave it the way it is.
111	No to lock out to boat ramp!
112	If the gate is placed that will create a mess and a backlog and a big pileup @ the boat ramp which will create arguments and feuds between people.
113	Sydney Harbour has very few launching facilities & Tunks park is one of the few which provide easy access on the north side. We need to maintain facilities like Tunks & have 24-hour access without parking fees. Boat owners & Fisher folk pay licence & registration fees that pay for much of these facilities - If the council does not want to pay to maintain these facilities or create a form of lockout then no money should come from recreational fishers
114	This is ridiculous. People use this ramp pre 7am especially during summer months...
115	It does not make sense at all to lock us out from using the ramp before 7:30. Most keen fisherman are already heading out the heads with their bait by then. We pay our taxes and licence fees and what not so that we can have the pleasure of using the waterways and we shouldn't be told when we can and can't do so.
116	Family & I have been using this boat ramp for 40yrs, getting there early & coming back in after-hours is a regular thing in our routine, closing Tunks with restrictive hours will be devastating to a lot fisherman & family's trying to enjoy the waterways, this Proposal should be taken off the table.
117	It is hard enough travelling across the city and paying excessive tolls without there and a greedy council now want to slam me with parking fees and being locked out before 7am.
118	Please do not close off this boat ramp. We are a family whom regularly use the ramp to launch our boat to access middle harbour. The kids enjoy wake boarding / fishing. This will lead us to travel further to other congested ramps to launch our boat.
119	I know I do not live in your local government. But I do own a boat I enjoy being on the water and love fishing with my family. There has been no issue a boat ramp before why is there any issue now if you lock.us out of the boat ramp that has been there for years which such a great ramp is not right
120	What a joke we pay our fishing licence to fish we should be able to launch our boats when we want!!!

121	<p>I am writing to you in regard to the Tunks Park Plan of Management/Masterplan for the boat ramp and trailer parking area. Do you have any idea that most recreational fishermen or/and boat goes early in the morning? between 4am/6am? How am I supposing to go fishing now? I would not mind paying for trailer parking if it is necessary but the hours are completely ridiculous! You'll kill a local industry and lose votes by implementing the proposal. This (see photo) is what we get when I try to park my trailer – but we get the blame as usual.</p>		
122	<p>What sort of madness is this that you would consider stopping people from being able to use Tunks park boat ramp? With the distinct lack of boat ramps this side of the harbour bridge, Tunks simply cannot be shut down. I launch my kayak there as it provides a great space to part and get the kayak out on the water. It seems to be one mad plan after another at the moment. Each time it's to protect the rights of an entitled few and typically the rich end of town.</p>		
123	<p>NO to the closure of the ramp till 7am. I like to be there before sun up.</p>		
124	<p>The 131-page long Draft Tunks Park POM, identifies a major issue as being traffic and parking, particularly during periods of peak use at weekends and during various sporting activities. <i>Pg. 10 states: "This Plan of Management has identified a focus on promoting sustainable travel to the park which seeks to reduce peak traffic volumes and parking demand."</i></p> <p>If the Draft POM seeks to "reduce peak traffic volumes and parking demand" there is too much emphasis on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) turning the waterfront area into a new and inviting focal point of the park b) encouraging cyclists c) better signage and wayfinding (i.e. advertising/promotion) <p>If the Draft POM seeks to attract more users to the park, most of whom will travel by car, then implementing any of the above will achieve exactly that.</p> <p><i>Page 85: 3.6.5 FORESHORE OPEN SPACE ISSUES</i></p> <p>While, in theory, improving the foreshore area seems a good idea, the reality is it will end up adding to vehicular congestion, traffic and parking problems. Potentially, a new children's natural play area; improved picnic facilities; access to water and waterfront decking will attract an additional 'new' group of park users who will, like most others, travel there by car.</p> <p>Compared to the rest of the park, the foreshore is a relatively narrow, small area. It already contains a public boat ramp used recreationally and commercially; a dinghy rack; fish-cleaning station; picnic and BBQ area; public walkway with seating and small waterfront area. Carrying out the Draft POM suggestions of adding a children's natural play area, waterfront decking, improved water access and picnic facilities together with the addition of bike racks, a kayak rack, a pop-up kiosk, (more) fitness stations and possibly a new toilet block, will turn this small section of the park into a cramped and busy area.</p> <p>Overuse and overcrowding would detract from the beauty and tranquillity of the waterfront and turn this small section into the park's focal point instead of encouraging the spread of people throughout the whole of Tunks Park.</p> <p>Realigning Brothers Avenue, altering the foreshore and car parking area would cause too great an upheaval for traffic, park users and local residents. It would virtually put the park out of action for several months and would be a costly exercise.</p>		

Implementation of any or all of the waterfront/foreshore “improvements” may turn out to be detrimental since it will probably result in even greater traffic volume and parking demands.

Page 84: Other Suggestions: Multi storey parking structure

This is not appropriate at the park entry and would ruin waterfront ambiance and views. Much more modest improvements could be made to the existing BBQ area, perhaps with the addition of another table and seating and more importantly, some shade trees. I understand local residents have previously expressed concern about the impact of trees on views. This could be overcome by sympathetic planting of shorter, bushy trees.

Page 44: 2.6.2 Eastern Park: The eastern park is the parkland area immediately east of Brothers Avenue

The above description of the area Eastern Park seems to be incorrect and should read: the parkland area immediately west of Brothers Avenue.

Money spent on moving the car park and developing the waterfront area (of questionable benefit anyway) would be better spent helping to drought-proof the park. A few years ago, when Tunks Park was re-turfed, a proposal was put forward to build a water-storage tank, topped with a viewing platform, under the grassy slope at the south-eastern end of the park close to the vehicular entrance off Brothers Avenue. This should be reconsidered.

Suggest that the 3m wide asphalt path on the south side of the field be continued all the way round on the north side of the field. A circular path makes more sense and would ease congestion on the path when sports fields are in full use. Presently, certain parts of the south side path are frequently flooded in wet weather and difficult to negotiate. This needs to be addressed so that there is easy access along the entire length of the path at all times

Suggest, more tree planting along the outer (southern) edge of this path to provide shade for walkers and respite for sports players during the hot summers.

Page 9: Draft POM States: “In 2018 Council’s sporting field resources are finite.”

With increasing population, development and high density living, it is incumbent on Council to make every effort to ear-mark and secure more open space for sporting and recreational facilities.

Page 58 - REGIONAL SPORTS FIELD CONTEXT: “From 2011-2036 regional population is projected to grow by 200,000 to 752,600 (+36%) which will place further pressure on sports facilities to maintain participation opportunities.

Further reason why Council need to source other areas for sports and recreation.

Page 95: Pedestrian/Cycle: 5. Encourage cycle visitation

Cyclists being directed to Tunks Park will also be encouraged to use the concrete walkway/path on the south side of the park. This is already a high traffic area for walkers who have to dodge off-leash dogs, the occasional skateboarder and cyclist. Many cyclists won’t just use their bikes to arrive at the park (requiring places to park their bikes) but will want to ride through the park and therefore most likely, will cycle along this one path.

Page 95: Traffic and Parking 1, 2, 3 & 4.

Any parking changes, need to be thoroughly trialled before implementation; they could exacerbate the situation by pushing the problem further out into surrounding streets. Also, point 4. While parking for park users should be equitable, local residents must have priority.

Page 105: Section 5: 4. VISUAL AND LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT

Investigate the feasibility of expanding the capability of the foreshore park area to cater for informal recreational activities including natural play.

Potentially this will attract additional park users which will create even more traffic/parking congestion.

Page 106: 5. PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ACCESS

Increased signage and promotion of use by cyclists has the potential to encourage cyclists to use the already well used largely pedestrian pathway through the park. Cyclists could be endangered travelling along the streets which access the park, especially during peak traffic periods.

Page 15: 1.9 Community Consultation - A summary of the key findings include:

- *There was a high level of satisfaction with the park as it currently exists. The community appreciated the amount of open space which was used by a variety of people and accommodated for different uses like sport, dog walking, families and fishing.*
- *The natural environment was a key focus for future maintenance and development. Ensuring that the grass and native vegetation were maintained and cared for was frequently mentioned.*

As stated, there is a high level of satisfaction with the park as it currently exists and keeping a natural environment is a key focus for the community. The various groups of park users already enjoy a good balance of activities. Improvements can be made to Tunks Park but in a low key and ‘natural’ way such as tree planting

	to create shade particularly along walk ways and in the BBQ area; better seating and water fountains; improving existing toilet facilities. There are small pockets along the edges of the park which could be utilised as natural play areas for children.
125	<p>I am a local resident of Northbridge and regularly use Tunks park in the morning for running, playing with my kids and launching boats for leisure and fishing. I am a licensed boat operator and I also use a Seadoo jet ski in Pittwater, Botany Bay and Hawkesbury river as they are excluded from Sydney harbour. The fact they are excluded for excessive noise due to the redundant and noisy 2 strokes, is no longer as relevant as the new inboard EFI engines are quieter and more efficient than outboard engines on boats that use Sydney waterways. The 2 strokes are from a prior era and almost non-existent in the PWC restricted zones. This is another matter altogether, but worth raising.</p> <p>I raise this issue, as when I was 15 in 1994, I lived in Lane Cove and had a small 40hp fibreglass runabout boat. I used to drive it to high school, St Ignatius' College Riverview. Taking my mates out for fishing, knee boarding, or a trip to Darling Harbour or Birkenhead point was some of my fondest memories growing up. I then gathered my savings up and begged my parents until I went blue in the face to chip in for a Yamaha wave runner. They eventually agreed and we bought it. We used to water-ski, go boating and enjoy lane cove river near Blackman Park. I also rowed in a Four and sailed at the lane cove 12ft skiff sailing club. Soon after the council banned skiing on the river and turned lane cove river into a 4-knot zone after Figtree bridge. So I sold my boat.</p> <p>Then PWC's were banned on Sydney harbor and all waterways west of the heads. So I sold my Yamaha wave runner (sit down jet ski/PWC). That wave runner was the most fun I'd had until I got a loving girlfriend when I was 27yo, so I was devastated for a long time when I sold it.</p> <p>This tradition of banning fun on the water in Sydney is depriving a generation of would be boat users. I ride mountain bikes these days and I have since I was 24yo. I'm 39 yo now. I've travelled the world to ride bikes down mountains (and back up sometimes) because mountain bikers are not welcome in Sydney and are a displaced group due to the government not providing trails and shutting existing ones down. We've lost most of our trails at Oxford Falls in the Garrigal National Park, Mona Vale, Warrimoo Oval in St Ives, Menai etc. In fact, I drive to Wollongong every 2nd weekend to ride trails supported by the local biking Illawarra biking alliances and councils. Or I drive 6 hours to Thredbo, 2 hours to Awaba or Ourimbah. Or fly to New Zealand to ride Rotorua, Queenstown. Sometimes I head to Vancouver in BC Canada.</p> <p>The death of fun on bikes, PWC's, boating in the harbor and now fishing and its boat ramps is backwards. It's outrageous that councils here in Sydney are working for a loud minority and not representing the silent majority that can use their boats and the harbour responsibility.</p> <p>The use of Tunks park boat ramp is important to fisherman and recreational users to access the Sydney heads and waterways, usually around 4am to 6am to be on the water before sunrise. Shutting the ramp before 7am is inconvenient for all boating users and north shore residents as it will foresee them to use Roseville boat ramp and create congestion and inconvenience. The Tunks park ramp has always had quiet and courteous users when I have been present.</p> <p>Further to this, if the ramp is shut until 7am it will create further congestion at Tunks park and fill the car park with frustrated boat users, which may make it unsafe for children walking in the car park area that can't be seen due to trailers obscuring driver's views plus they will be taking up car spaces near the ramp. This will force parents like me to park up the road of either of the two access roads to Tunks park. This means more walking with children in areas crowded with boats and trailers.</p> <p>For these reasons of common-sense, convenience, allowing existing boat ramp users to access traditional ramps is critical for the enjoyment we have always expected to have being Sydney residents.</p> <p>Bring back the fond memories to Sydney siders. Allow them to use Tunks Park, allow them to use PWC's in the harbor during responsible hours, allow mountain bikers to ride trails by partnering with council to maintain and build sustainable trails.</p> <p>I urge the council to make Sydney great again, don't pander to the minority that doesn't see the harbour for what it can be, but want it closed as something to look at when they sip on a pinot noir from their waterfront balcony compiling items to their hit list of fun they want to kill off in Sydney.</p>
126	Please do not take away the boat ramp at Tunks Park, me and my family use this ramp regularly and to take it away from us will mean I'll have to travel a lot further away to take my family out on the boat.
127	<p>It has come to my attention that time restrictions are planned for Tunks Park. There are a minimum amount of good public ramps to access the north middle Harbour. Tunks is a very well-located access point to many anglers. Closing the Park until 7am will not go well with anglers as we tend to be at ramps around the 5am mark if not earlier at Tunks Park due to limited space.</p> <p>Please consider the Australian angler in your plans.</p>

128	<p>1. I use Tunks Park at all hours of the day.... 4 am boat launch with the boys, or midday lunches with the families.</p> <p>2. Midday boating with my family is challenging as the site is congested. There is inadequate trailer parking.</p> <p>The atmosphere on a summer day with the cricket, family get together and fishos cleaning there catch all at the same location is the true Australian lifestyle.</p>
129	<p>Just writing to advise the gate at the Tunks Park boat ramp will cause congestion on other ramps and ruin a lot of people's great day out in the harbour.</p> <p>We often stay much longer than the 6hrs parking limit on the water as the traffic is terrible and leaving after peak hours as towing a boat in traffic will cause more congestion in traffic.</p> <p>Please keep the boat ramp gated for early users and 12hr parking limit.</p>
130	<p>I am a user of the Tunks Park ramp during the woman months. My own family and I have been using this ramp many years.</p> <p>Due to the nature of how we utilise the harbour means Tunks Park is the safest alternative out of every single ramp in Sydney.</p> <p>With young children with me that use this right to access the harbour would be nothing short of devastated to see it locked out till 7 AM every morning. We only have a very small boat for us to access the areas that we use in the harbour would mean we would need to load the boat in the Parramatta River. Driving about over this distance remain greater risk through potentially dangerous waters to access the areas that we do. My family and I do not wish to see the times Park boat ramp locked out.</p> <p>Not only does it affect myself and my family I dislike it will also affect charter operators and businesses that utilise this ramp on the harbour that need early morning access.</p>
131	<p>The boat ramp and boat trailer parking facilities at Tunks Park are excellent. The limitations are the number of boat trailer parks available and any proposal to limit the number of these would be most unreasonable. This is illustrated by the number of car-trailer combinations that have to be parked up Lower Cliff Road on most weekends, especially in the summer.</p> <p>Having used the boat ramp at Tunks Park regularly for over 15 years I have benefitted from the improvements that have been made and strongly encourage there be no diminution of these facilities in the process of a long-term management plan for Tunks Park.</p>
132	<p>Hi I would just like to give my opinion on this matter, Right so Tunks park is one of 2 boat ramps available on the north side of the harbour for the north shore the other being Roseville Now I live in Tempe and mostly use rose bay which is disgraceful in its self with the lack of parking being the only ramp with access to the harbour in the eastern suburbs, I quite often take my boat to my gf place in Northbridge and we use the Tunks park ramp a lot now of anything this and other ramps should be upgraded for more parking and of that is not the case then put more ramps in as the access is a joke for a city this size and with its population I mean I have to get down there at 530am just to get a park so come on councils pull ya heads in and save this ramp .</p>
133	<p>I truly cannot believe you are considering putting paid parking at Tunks park boat ramp, it is the only place where we can take our kids to go fishing without having to take them outside or through middle harbour! It already costs an arm and a leg to get to that ramp through tolls & fuel, not to mention we stop and buy bait and all necessary items from local shops around that area. To make it even worse you want to put a time limit on when we can and can't use it. If the local people are unhappy about the current situation, then maybe they shouldn't have moved next to the water or the boat ramp and that's what you should expect when you live in such areas. Honestly destroying our state bit by bit, election time can't come soon enough for everyone because it's time things changed throughout our government all the way through to the local councils! Disgraceful.</p>
134	<p>I've been using this facility since the early 1980s and in the last 30 odd years very little has done outside a pontoon and a slight expansion to the parking area a lot of which is not available to car and trailer users. Now the council has the opportunity to implement a major upgrade to the facility and the first thing you want to do is all but make it impossible for boat owners to use the boat ramp and parking areas outside the projected lock out times. As a boat owner who has used this facility on regular basis for a long time, who spent a lot of money in your council and other council areas in the greater Sydney harbour area I find these potential alterations and lock out times an absolute disgrace. Being a resident of western Sydney who has to travel all the way into Sydney to enjoy the wonderful environs that harbour offers I thought that the councils first decision in the initial process would be to consider a major upgrade of the boat ramp pontoon and parking facilities for the boating enthusiast, but it's obvious that you want discourage the boating community from spending their hard earned in your precinct and the only reason I can see is to keep the whinging local neighbours happy make your money back on the upgrades. I respect the neighbourhood and the people who live there, but it's a little like whinging about aeroplane noise after moving into mascot 50 yrs after the airport was built. I think removing some taps to limit or stop flushing on the far noisier</p>

	2 stroke outboards a good idea but the general over view is misguided and extremely poorly thought out as most who live in these parts of Sydney consider a packed car park full of boat trailers a poor look, these people are as misguided as the people who sit in your council chambers on a regular basis.
135	You should: Not introduce paid parking, with a maximum of 6 hours, and Don't install boom gates to limit daily and weekend access times. This is one of the few ramps with parking that I have to go to, too access Sydney Harbour, if you alter what we have and add fees, I will at a personal inconvenience to myself, go somewhere else (and to their financial benefit, as I buy food and fuel when I'm local), to launch my boat.
136	The proposal for Tunks Park is not reasonable for the many water users in the North Sydney area. Limited access, additional parking restrictions and reduction in trailer specific spots is unreasonable for the many residents who use this facility especially retirees.
137	Tunks park has been and still is a shared resource. It is a very important boat ramp facility to many people outside of the North Sydney council area. Your current plan to lock out boat ramp users at night clearly affect the many fishers who use this facility only at night. This is obviously a reaction to a few wealthy residents who feel they have more rights than other Sydney siders. I liken them to those that moved in next to Luna park and then complain about the noise. Shutting off the taps to prevent people flushing motors is practice and reasonable in my opinion. Locking fishers out at night is not acceptable and I would go as far as saying offensive. Parking restrictions of any kind for cars with boat trailers again reeks of elitism arrogance and money grabbing. An application to the NSW state government for funding to assist with construction. Of a multi-level car park I would think be a win win. A ban on motor flushing at any time also reasonable. If you close the northern entry to the boat ramp it is effectively locking out boaters. This would be a travesty.
138	I write in strong opposition to the proposal to reduce the hours of Tunks Park boat ramp. 1. The rational for this seems to be local residents' objections. Please understand that your role in government is to counter NIMBYism for the benefit of the whole community. The boat ramp has been there for decades and has even been the subject of large scale state funding. Residents affected by noise chose to purchase their properties next to a boat ramp. Please do not give in to their selfishness now that they are resident beside a public facility. The public should not suffer for their un-paid-for comforts. I live on a busy road - surely I would enjoy it more if traffic were blocked from entering the road before 7am and after 10pm. But just as surely that is an incredibly stupid thing to expect or ask for. So too for those who live beside a boat ramp. 2. if the issue is noise, and the noise is from boats using the tap to wash their motors at un-sociable hours, surely a sensible thing to do is to put a timer on the tap . It would cost very little, and the early/late hours' users can easily wash their boats at home. Please, this is a far better and simpler solution. 3. the impact on boating users and on day-time users is immense. Tunks is the only major boat ramp left on the north shore - cutting off early/late hours' access will only concentrate boating users' arrival and departure times to 7am and 10pm. How will these boundary times be enforced? Think of the expense of having someone monitor this. The proposal as it to limit hours is terrible. Please implement no change, or if you are unwilling to stand up to NIMBYist in full, at least implement a sensible solution and put a timer on the tap.
139	I agree that there are noisy two stroke motors and also that these should be restricted in the early hours of the morning for the benefit of residents. My submission would be that vessel with an older 2 stroke motor, or those not compliant with reasonable decibel output (and/or emissions outputs) be restricted or not able to access Tunks Park from 6 am in winter and 5 am in summer.
140	The Boating Industry Association (BIA) represents more than 1100 businesses in Australia with our members operating in manufacturing, wholesale and retail of products and services within the boating industry. These include, but are not limited to, new boat sales, charter operators, mooring and marina operators, yard/trade services, engine and aftermarket products, used boat sales and services, retail and wholesale operators across all sectors, boat builders, component manufacturers and fabricators, professional service providers, media, education providers, boat storage operators, kindred sporting groups such as sailing and boating clubs. The 2018 BIA State of Industry Survey shows direct employment in the sector is in excess of 27,000 with a direct turnover of greater than \$8bn. NSW accounts for 40% of the national industry across all metrics, including boating participation. The North Sydney metropolitan area is home to approximately 2350 registered boats, of which about 50% are trailer boats.

	<p>The BIA welcomes discussion about the use of shared recreational facilities and community amenities, whether this be with other recreational users playing field sports, or residents enjoying the local environment of Tunks Park. In such a discussion, the BIA supports boaters' access to the local waterways via the long-established and highly-valued boat ramp and associated facilities within the park, acknowledging that boaters are always content to abide by regulations covering their activities where such are effective, appropriate, equitable and reasonable.</p> <p>The current regulatory settings imposed by various state agencies and Council bylaws covering use of the boat ramp at Tunks Park have always been considered as meeting these criteria. This includes noise regulation and parking restrictions, both of which are understood by boaters and effective in managing concentrations of use of the facilities. In addition, the existing limitation on available parking spaces and time-based limitation on use of amenities at the ramp itself, in way of tap timers, is also an effective control on the number of boaters using the park and the times at which they do so.</p> <p>Boaters are aware that the ramp is located close to a residential area and fully appreciate and respect the quiet enjoyment of the local community. If Council were to provide for enforcement of existing controls, such as park rangers managing time-limited parking and afterhours noise, then it is believed any inadvertent contravention of the rules in place would be readily curtailed.</p> <p>Additional proposals to impose further restrictions on parking by way of an hourly charge for parking would need to provide for a reasonable period for boat parking: the suggested six-hour period is considered such. It is also considered reasonable that this arrangement be extended, where appropriate, to surrounding streets, preferably with a series of dedicated boat trailer-only parking bays. However, the level of fee charged must also be reasonable and cognisant of the range of fees and charges to which boat owners are already subjected.</p> <p>The Tunks Park boat ramp is a regional facility that has been supported in recent years with grant funding from Maritime NSW to improve the ramp itself and install floating pontoons to assist access and egress to the water. These works were funded to ensure continued safe use of the ramp as part of the boating infrastructure within the North Sydney Council area, as one of only two such facilities. Proposals to limit access to the ramp by imposing a curfew is considered contrary to the wider public interest and at odds with the previous and ongoing support of the state maritime agency.</p> <p>As a regional facility, it would not be acceptable to impose any restriction on non-North Sydney residents accessing parking. Similarly, while proposals for local residents to access the park via public transport and dedicated park and ride services and supported, this is not a workable solution for boat ramp users.</p> <p>In summary, the BIA does not believe there is a requirement to restrict access to or use of the boat ramp and associated facilities and that use of existing controls and enforcement measures, perhaps with some minor enhancement with regard to charging, would be the most appropriate way to manage concerns of local residents and other users of Tunks Park.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission on behalf of the boating industry and boating community in Sydney.</p>
141	<p>Amateur Fisherman's Association of NSW: We refer to the above where there are proposed changes which we believe there was insufficient consultation with the public and the proposed changes will be detrimental to boaters attempting to use this facility.</p> <p>Many AFA of NSW members use Tunks Park to launch their boats during the year.</p> <p>Upon discussions within our weekly meetings it was unanimous that AFA members are opposed to the potential intended changes.</p> <p>Apparently the intention is to reduce the existing number of parking for vehicles with trailers and reduce the area which is required to launch and retrieve a boat that will potentially be a safety issue.</p> <p>Apparently Council is considering introducing paid parking with a 6-hour limit and or installing boom gates to limit access throughout the week and on weekends, probably sunset to sunrise.</p> <p>During the past decade upgrading has occurred for boaters by way of the Better Boating Program which the expenditure of public monies has nearly exceeded \$500,000.00 ensuring safer access to the water for the public.</p> <p>The monies from the "Better Boating Program" and now known as the "Boating Now Program" is derived from recreational boating licences and registrations. Thereby, people who have the aforementioned are all stakeholders in any expenditure where improvements have occurred from either the "BBP" or "BNP".</p> <p>Peak bodies such as; "Recreational Fishing Alliance", "Fishing Clubs Association of NSW", "Boat Owners Association of NSW" were never consulted prior to Council proposing these intended changes.</p> <p>The consultation process was not a level playing field which was evident by the number of residents who responded as opposed to non-residents although they are all stakeholders.</p>

	<p>The Tunks Park boat ramp facility has been identified by Transport Roads & Maritime Services as a Regional Facility. (Extract) – NSW Boat Ramp Facility Guidelines: - “A Regional boat ramp would typically be a large-scale facility designed to accommodate a high level of usage attracted from a boat user catchment area covering several different localities. It would typically comprise a wide boat ramp with multiple lanes and sufficient manoeuvring and parking areas to handle high traffic flow.”</p> <p>The boat ramp was built many decades ago and therefore residents living in close proximity would be aware of the facility and from time to time noise could occur, however perhaps it is not always boaters who are to blame. Problems with noise were evident at another boat ramp facility on Sydney Harbour which in the main was not boaters who were causing the noise pollution, however people with loud music and burn outs.</p> <p>Has Council asked the question of the people who have raised their concerns with Council as to what the actual noises are? How often is the noise evident and are there particular times? Is the noise more evident during weekdays or weekends? Have rangers been involved attempting to ascertain who is creating the noise? Apparently, on occasions some boaters will run their motors to flush the motor during the period from sunset to sunrise. We understand that potentially this matter has been resolved with a timer (in line) to the tap, thereby flushing is restricted to daylight hours only. Indeed, I believe that some boaters have used the taps on the fish cleaning table, so perhaps the timer has to also be placed on these taps. No doubt this solution should significantly reduce noise created by boaters attempting to flush out their motor. Has Council erected signage advising of the restrictions of water access?</p> <p>Apparently, Council announced in 2007 their strategy for Foreshore Access was: - “To promote and improve access links to the North Sydney foreshore for the local and wider community from both the land and water to continue a sustainable use and enjoyment of Sydney Harbour as a unique waterfront environment”. The potential changes are not consistent with Council's vision as the changes will basically reduce the current level of access for boaters who utilise this facility. Reducing the current vehicle / trailer parking could impact on adjoining streets, which will further annoy local residents.</p> <p>According to Council many people are not adhering to specific parking restrictions, thereby placing further pressure on the limited parking. Are Rangers providing fines for vehicles that do not comply? On many occasions vehicles are parked in; -” vehicle / trailer parking” which can be very frustrating.</p> <p>According to RMS – Maritime, every year boat registrations are increasing, so by reducing vehicle / trailer parking will potentially impact on boaters attempting to access Sydney Harbour.</p>
142	<p>You can't do this, I drive all the way from Bankstown, not fair.</p> <p>We pay license to fish and access to ramps you don't own them.</p>
143	<p>Hi. Please reconsider your approach to Tunks park lockout I'm a boater and love using that ramp. I launch early in the morning. I'm guessing that the complaints came from some idiot revving their motor at a silly time while cleaning it. Simple answer is to put a timer on the wash-down tap. Closing us out early in the morning and taking away already limited parking is not the answer. The boat ramp belongs to everyone not just the people who live there. Thank you.</p>
144	<p>I've always loved fishing and it has forever been my dream to own a boat that I can take to a ramp and head out to enjoy the glorious Sydney Harbour and surrounds. A few years ago, a friend and I finally accomplished that dream and purchased a little fishing runabout and since we've owned it, it has been the highlight of our weeks to get it out on the water when we can for a fish and a catch up. If we're lucky, we might even jag an elusive kingfish on occasion.</p> <p>As we both live in Cremorne and Neutral Bay respectively and don't have the now exclusive privilege of being able to own or live in a house with a functioning driveway on the Lower North Shore, we both live in apartments so that we can still live in this amazing part of the world.</p> <p>A local resident advised me some time ago that the council were investigating a redevelopment plan for Tunks Park, so I headed to the council website to give a bit of input from a boat owners' perspective on the park. Given the options to choose from as to which part of the park I used the most, the boat ramp was not listed on the options. Assuming that the planning proposal must not have affected the boat ramp or its facilities, I figured that there was no reason for me to voice an opinion on the future proposal for the park.</p> <p>A week ago, I was advised that there were significant changes to the ramp and its facilities included in the published document which would adversely affect the way in which I would be able to use the park as a stakeholder in future if the current plan is implemented as it is currently written.</p> <p>Given that myself and many other local trailer boat owners in the area do not have the now privilege of being able to own or live in a free-standing house in the area which includes an accessible tap for flushing outboard engines after use, we rely on the wash bay provided at the ramp in order to be able to clean the salt from the engines cooling system to prevent it from salt build up which could result in a seized engine. If these wash bay taps are removed, as one of the few practical</p>

regional boat ramps in the area, this would impact massively on local boat owners who are unable to use the ramp as initially intended, forcing them to further congest the few other practical ramps located in the area.

Page 84 and 117 refer to the possible removal of the makeshift wash bay area and taps as an option to appease concern from local residents caused from the noise produced by boats and while flushing engines. While I appreciate that there may be some residents adjoining the park who have been living there since before the installation of the boat ramp, there must also be many others who have moved into the area knowing full well that they were moving into an area where one of the few practical regional boat ramps existed in operation.

The table on page 117 of the proposal lists *Liaise with RMS for potential to limit Tunks Park boat ramp operating hours to prevent late night use doe (sic) to proximity to residences* as an option on the issue of late night use of taps to clean engines. Given the significance of this ramp and the fact that many users of the ramp launch their boats before dawn and return after nightfall, most of them highly considerate to keep their noise to a minimum given the time of day, the proposal to shut the ramp outside of daylight hours could appear to be seen as an oppressive move targeting boat users trying to do the right thing, some of them relying on a pre-dawn start to be able to run their businesses.

I suggest that as this ramp is one of only a few practical regional boat ramps in the area (with the previous upgrade paid for by licensing fees), a dedicated wash bay with washing facilities be installed at the park, possibly even with timed taps that only operate within the hours between dawn and sunset so as not to adversely affect the local residents outside of daylight hours as a more logical approach. I myself have been down at the ramp many times before sunrise to launch and have also noticed several charter boats that run their business from this ramp. Every time I have been down there before dawn, all operators have appeared to be highly considerate of the noise produced at that hour of the morning and kept car/launching/outboard noise at a respectable level given that many people are still asleep at this hour.

I can understand the concern from the local residents outside of daylight hours as to the noise created at the boat ramp, but as the report states, it is primarily from the cleaning of engines, which is a necessity but could also possibly only be restricted to during daylight hours to minimise disturbance. The introduction of timed taps would remedy this issue.

The launching and retrieving of boats, if boat operators are considerate enough to only idle their boats out of the bay at the posted speed limit should have minimal noise impact on houses bordering the park. Possibly the use of more effective signage and *actual* consultation with boat users could help to address awareness of excess noise produced after hours so that the use of the ramp after dark can remain with minimal impact on local residents.

The planned proposal (page 83) includes details about reducing the number of boat parking spaces to convert to car spaces. Given that as has already been discussed in the proposal, during peak periods there are not enough boat trailer spaces as it is, it would seem logical that if the number of trailer spaces were reduced, boat owners would be forced to park further into the adjoining streets rather than the cars that had replaced them.

There was also discussion of blocking off certain parts of the carpark (refer proposed layout page 125) which would no doubt increase congestion which this plan is intended to reduce, with no areas for boats to queue and no stand-alone washing bay included, which, given the large turning area required by some boat trailers could result in a gridlock at the ramp during times of heavy use, increasing rather than reducing congestion. A more logical approach would be to still provide an area on the side road beside the foreshore park (as is in place) for boats to be able to queue for the ramp, away from the turning circle and area in front of the ramp which trailer users require to be able to line their trailers up to access the ramp.

On the topic of introducing paid parking for boat trailers, it appears that even though boat users of the ramp have no choice of parking elsewhere and commuting to the park given the fact that they need to be able to launch and retrieve their boats, they are the ones being targeted for paid parking.

Page 83 and 84 of the proposal detail the possible options for paid parking within the carpark and surrounding streets. Within the options, only 3 of the 5 options include paid parking for cars within the carpark as opposed to all 5 of the 5 options including paid boat trailer parking, once again appearing to target boat users at one of the few practical boat ramps in the area. If paid parking were to be introduced into the carpark and surrounding areas, where would the proceeds of the parking go? Would they be reinvested into the park and its facilities, even a shuttle bus provided for peak times or back into council revenue?

Another issue that caught my attention with this current proposal is that on page 15, section 1.9 the document states:

A community consultation program was designed to help inform the development of the Masterplan and Plan of Management. This was undertaken by Straight Talk who adopted an inclusive approach to ensure all community and stakeholder voices and points of view were heard and understood including: residents,

	<p><i>recreational park users (including dog walkers, boat ramp users), schools, Parent and Friends committees, sporting clubs, personal trainers, Bushcare groups, Precincts, community action groups and relevant government authorities.</i></p> <p>I have spoken to quite a few boat users while using the ramp and a couple of charter operators who run their businesses from the ramp and none of them have advised that they have been approached for consultation or asked their opinion on their issues with the ramp or surrounding park. I would be interested to know how this consultation process was actually run.</p> <p>. Page 15, 2.9 states that <i>the highest level of participation in the consultation program came from local residents with more limited participation from other stakeholder groups.</i> I would like to hope that the community consultation sought to provide a balanced feedback from <i>all</i> users and stakeholders of the park and its facilities equally, seeking feedback from equal numbers of users of various parts of the park <i>as well as</i> the local residents residing near the park as this proposal could seem to appear as an attack on boat users by the local residents with boat users consultation not being sought to be able to present their needs at a regional boat ramp as stakeholders of the park also.</p> <p>Leading to page 16, noting <i>"a summary of key findings includes" - Many community members contest the amount of parking space and noise allowance that is given to boat and trailer users. This is particularly an issue for residents who hear noise very early in the morning and for sports ground users who do not have access to valuable parking spots during peak times on the weekend.</i></p> <p>The only reference including the boat ramp in this summary is an anti-boating reference with no mention of issues that ramp users, as stakeholders of the park at one of <i>the few practical regional boat ramps in the area</i> also face. Boat users that I have spoken to at the ramp while launching and retrieving have expressed concern about the removal of cleaning taps previously in the year and when told about the possible proposal of limiting the usable hours of the boat ramp were appalled as there were other more logical options stated above that could be implemented to reduce the after-hours noise produced that was adversely affecting the local residents.</p> <p>Getting out onto the harbour on a beautiful sunny (and sometimes rainy) day has always been one of the highlights of my week, and while it's concerning to see that some misuse of the ramp has been adversely affecting certain local residents, it's also concerning to see some of the knee-jerk reactions included as options within this proposal to try and address these issues that favour certain groups while isolating other groups of stakeholders. Investigating more logical options that could benefit a variety of stakeholders of the park, while <i>also</i> trying to reduce the disturbance to local residents that have moved in beside an established regional boat ramp would seem to be a more inclusive and democratic process.</p> <p>I am saddened to see that within the scope of this proposal that there could appear to be seen quite an anti-boating tone and I can only assume that some of these people offering such negative feedback have never had the pleasure of experiencing the freedom of putting a boat in and being able to explore Sydney harbour and its breathtaking surrounds.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration. I can only hope that my input into the future design of the park as a boat ramp user carries fully as much weight as any other stakeholders' input into the proposal.</p>
145	<p>After being made aware of the proposed changes to Tunks Park, I have read the proposal and have issues to raise with certain parts of the plan regarding the impartiality of the consultation process and possibility of removal of current regional boat ramp facilities included within it.</p> <p>Here is a brief summary of my issues with the current Plan of Management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 15, Consultation Proposal states "This was undertaken by Straight Talk who adopted an inclusive approach to ensure all community and stakeholder voices and points of view were heard and understood including: residents, recreational park users (including dog walkers, boat ramp users), schools, Parent and Friends committees, sporting clubs, personal trainers, Bushcare groups, Precincts, community action groups and relevant government authorities. • Suggest that given the regional boat ramp is an integral part of Tunks Park and has been for many years that local boat users were not included in consultation to same extent as other stakeholder groups of the park resulting in a possibly biased consultation affecting the proposed outcome of the plan. • Propose that boat users were not considered equal stakeholders in this proposal of the Park as, when I went to the council feedback website previously to provide input of my use of the facilities of the park, that the boat ramp was not listed in the area of the park that I used most. This led me to believe that the boat ramp and its facilities would not be altered in the scope of the proposal. I therefore did not give any feedback to influence the decision-making process.

It was only when I was made aware of the current proposal that I realised that significant detrimental changes to the ramp and its facilities were included. I am sure that I cannot be the only person that this omission has affected, leaving boat users underrepresented in the decision-making process.

- Page 16, "A summary of the key findings include"
"Many community members contest the amount of parking space and noise allowance that is given to boat and trailer users. This is particularly an issue for residents who hear noise very early in the morning and for sports ground users who do not have access to valuable parking spots during peak times on the weekend."
- Suggest that the only reference to the ramp included in these findings appears to be an attack on local boat users who should be entitled to use this ramp as intended as one of the few practical regional boat ramps in the wider area, albeit taking steps to minimise disturbance to local residents outside of daylight hours as a common courtesy. None of the concerns from the boating community as stakeholders (whether intentional or unintentional) have been sought or listed on this page to provide a balanced view.
- Page 81, 82. Brothers Avenue realignment (figure 3.7)
The proposed layout shows the removal of the side road beside the foreshore park which boat trailers must use to queue during busy periods. Removal of this side road or an area for boats to be able to queue would cause mayhem and even further traffic congestion with boat trailers and general cars forced to queue in either of the road entrances and at times completely obstruct the traffic flow. If the needs of the boat ramp had been adequately considered in this proposal, this issue would have become quite obvious.
"The congestion to the approaches to Tunks Park at Saturday morning peak suggests that emergency access if needed during this time could be difficult, and it is necessary to define the most suitable route for the park to be accessed by an emergency vehicle during that time."
- Oppose removal of a side road for boats to queue as this has a high future potential to cause more congestion than there is currently, which is contrary to the objectives currently stated in the proposal
- Suggest installation of dedicated boat queuing area that does not impede on flow of general traffic be factored into amended proposal.
- Suggest dedicated wash bay (which is considered an integral facility of a regional boat ramp) that does not impede the flow of traffic be installed to reduce the possibility of traffic congestion (being one of the key issues contained within this proposal).
- Oppose current plan of realignment of Brothers Avenue without dedicated boat queuing area as this has a high chance of causing further congestion which it is intended to reduce.
- Page 83, Management of boat trailer parking
"Pay Parking to general and boat trailer parking within Tunks carpark during peak times only --- Investigate and, if feasible, trial application of pay parking with a time limit (say 2---3 hours) during a designated peak use period such as 9am to 1pm winter Saturdays. This would be most effective to both general parking and boat trailer parking spaces (see also 'Management of Boat Trailer parking following) noting that boat parking would necessitate 6hr limit to be practical. Priced parking could exclude North Sydney Residents or potentially include residents during the designated peak use period to encourage their access to the park by means other than motor vehicle."
- Oppose introduction of paid parking for boat trailers only as boat owners as equal stakeholders of the park need their trailers within close vicinity of the ramp. Again could be seen as anti-boating sentiment in a public proposal.
- Oppose introduction of 6-hour peak time limit from 9AM as this would result in an influx of boats (which would normally be spread out over the course of the afternoon) returning around 3PM causing further traffic congestion. A problem to also note with this proposal is that if this 6-hour limit were installed as proposed, that by 3PM, the congestion within the carpark due to high demand would already be easing by this time, as many park users had already finished their park activities and would have previously left the carpark resulting in lower carpark demand with no need for further parking restrictions.
- Support excluding North Sydney Council residents from paid parking if instated as this is a public park, paid for and maintained by rates from council residents.
- Page 84, Summary of parking management measures to be further investigated.
- Oppose the fact that only 3 of the 5 options in this table include paid parking for cars while 5 of the 5 options include paid parking for boat trailers.
- Suggest that if paid parking were introduced, it apply equally to boat trailers and general parking so as not to be seen as targeting the boating community.

- Suggest that if paid parking were to be introduced at the park, that the proceeds of the paid parking be reinvested into the facilities of the park so as not to be seen as further council revenue raising at the expense of the public using public facilities.
- Page 84, Boat ramp and foreshore access
 “Residents in the community workshop forums identified that after dark noise through engine cleaning is a regular disruption to local amenity. The presence of potable water taps in the vicinity of the boat ramp which are used by boat users has been identified as the major root cause of the noise complaints.”
 “2 taps have been removed (May/June 2018) by Council’s Parks Department. The Parks Department in conjunction with Council’s Rangers to continue to manage and monitor the issue.”
- Oppose the removal of these taps as a dedicated wash bay should be regarded by Maritime and most trailer boat users as an absolute necessity at one of the few practical regional boat ramps of this significance in the wider area. As many trailer boat owners within the council area do not possess the now privilege of owning or living in a stand-alone house on the Lower North Shore with a driveway and an accessible tap in order to clean their engines, a dedicated wash bay must be considered as a necessity for a regional boat ramp of this significance so as not to force boat users to have to use other ‘at capacity’ ramps with adequate facilities, further increasing the congestion at these ramps.
- Suggest introducing taps on timers that only operate during daylight hours to appease the concerns of local residents concerned with after-hours noise as more logical and less knee-jerk reaction to this issue.
- Suggest liaising with Maritime to seek their honest opinion on issue of removal of wash bay and taps at a Maritime funded regional boat ramp.
- Page 84, Boat washing and engine cleaning
 “Review with RMS long term sustainability of water availability and use at boat---ramps in relation to water quality and reducing potable water use.”
- Suggest that if council were investigating possibility of removal of wash bay taps to reduce water usage for environmental reasons that water usage would just be transferred to other boat ramps or private taps with adequate washing facilities and not actually reduce net water usage, given that boat users require a fresh water source to flush engines.
- Suggest that, after having seen state of harbour water quality at ramp following recent rain, boat users are not the primary source of the threat to harbour water quality given the litter and runoff currently in the harbour as a result of the input into the bay from stormwater drains.
- Page 110, “Action”
 “Parking beyond marked or accepted parking extents to local streets in particular at driveways”
 Page 81, “The Boulevard and Rowlinson Parade residents identified that vehicles parked too close to driveways can make existing driveways challenging and potentially unsafe due to being unsighted to oncoming traffic”
- Suggest council paint markings on roadway to clearly delineate areas where cars and trailers may park and where they must not park so as to not impede on local residents’ access and egress to their driveways during peak periods.
- Suggest enforcement of vehicles remaining on the correct side of these markings by council rangers.
- Page 117, “Action”
 “Liaise with RMS for potential to limit Tunks Park boat ramp operating hours to prevent late night use doe (sic) to proximity to residences”
- Oppose after hours’ closure of the boat ramp, referring to previous excerpt:
 “Residents in the community workshop forums identified that after dark noise through engine cleaning is a regular disruption to local amenity. The presence of potable water taps in the vicinity of the boat ramp which are used by boat users has been identified as the major root cause of the noise complaints.”
- Suggest installation of taps on timers in dedicated wash bay only able to be used within daylight hours as the most logical solution to reducing after-hours disturbance to local residents while minimising impact to boat owners as equal stakeholders of the park given the significance of this regional ramp as one of only a few within the wider area.
 I have been down at the ramp many times before dawn and the vast majority of boat users I have come across are highly conscious of the noise that they produce launching and retrieving their boats given the time of day. Propose more effective signage and *actual* consultation with boat owners to increase awareness of the need to keep impact to local residents at a minimum outside of daylight hours.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest that closure of the boat ramp outside of daylight hours is a knee-jerk reaction to the issue of after-hours noise produced at the ramp when more logical options can be explored which do not victimise the boating community as legitimate stakeholders of this park. • Propose that closure of ramp outside of daylight hours could pose potential safety hazard to members of boating community that may have been caught offshore due to circumstances beyond their control (adverse weather, breakdown) and unable to return to ramp before ramp closure, leaving them helpless after an already unpleasant ordeal until ramp reopened the following morning. <p>I am saddened to see that within the scope of this proposal that there could appear to be seen quite an anti-boating tone and I can only assume that some of these people offering such negative feedback have never had the pleasure of experiencing the freedom of putting a boat in and being able to explore Sydney harbour and its breathtaking surrounds on a sunny day. It would be nice to think that the people offering this feedback could someday see the other side of this coin and realise the pure joy and freedom able to be experienced by this lifestyle that they have such negative feelings toward.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration. I can only hope that my input into the future design of the park as a local boat ramp user carries fully as much weight as any other stakeholders' input into the proposal in a perfect world.</p> <p>I have attached a fuller explanation of my submission to give some context, which I would highly recommend that you have a read in order to be able to assist you in forming a balanced and unbiased position on the future proposal of the park taking into account the needs of ALL stakeholders of the park equally so as not to be seen as spearheading the proposal toward a pre-determined outcome and supporting what could be seen as an extension of the councils already negative stance on registration paying trailer boat owners.</p>
146	Use Tunks Park boat ramp regularly and launch around 5am as do many of my friends.
147	Do not close the boat ramp till 7.30 because of rich people complaining! I work as a school teacher and love fishing before work and educate students about the ecosystem and environmental factors
148	Please do not impose restrictions on boat and trailer use within the park because it will only lead to added pressure at other boat ramps in Sydney that are already operating under strain from volume.
149	This proposal is a joke as fisherman like myself are well and truly on the water before 7.30am some blokes make their living putting in at Tunks park from charters to divers etc this proposal is a joke and needs to be opposed
150	Please don't go ahead with this. I have visited Tunks Park many times and love the way it is. Yes, it can get a little busy at times but this is plan not the answer. This is basically "Locking is out" from enjoying the harbour. This type of plan/action will only encourage other popular areas/attractions to copy and only then will you realise when it affects you, how much of an impact a decision like this will have on your weekends and life. Please leave it the way it is.
151	No to lock out to boat ramp!
152	Sydney Harbour has very few launching facilities & Tunks park is one of the few which provide easy access on the north side. We need to maintain facilities like Tunks & have 24 hr access without parking fees. Boat owners & Fisher folk pay licence & registration fees that pay for much of these facilities - If the council does not want to pay to maintain these facilities or create a form of lockout then no money should come from recreational fishers.
153	This is ridiculous. People use this ramp pre 7am especially during summer months...
154	Don't lock us out of the boat ramp.
155	Family & I have been using this boat ramp for 40yrs, getting there early & coming back in after-hours is a regular thing in our routine, closing Tunks with restrictive hours will be devastating to a lot fisherman & family's trying to enjoy the waterways, this Proposal should be taken off the table.
156	It is hard enough travelling across the city and paying excessive tolls without there and a greedy council now want to slam me with parking fees and being locked out before 7am. Disgusting behaviour.
157	Please do not close off this boat ramp. We are a family whom regularly use the ramp to launch our boat to access middle harbour. The kids enjoy wake boarding / fishing. This will lead us to travel further to other congested ramps to launch our boat.
158	I know I do not live in your local government. But I do own a boat I enjoy being on the water and love fishing with my family. There has been no issue a boat ramp before why is there any issue now if you lock.us out of the boat ramp that has been there for years which such a great ramp is not right
159	What a joke we pay our fishing licence to fish we should be able to launch our boats when we want!!!

160	I understand there will be opening and closing hours restricting the use of the boat ramp. This is not an acceptable way for a public ramp to operate. Otherwise the rest of the masterplan looks good.
161	I think it is absolutely ridiculous to have limited times on the parking as it should be 24/7. These days everybody works different hours. Some prefer to get in early. They should not be limited.
162	I am against not allowing access to the boat ramp before a proposed 7am time, I travel to this boat ramp and this would be a huge burden to close it. It's unfair to stop fishermen to restrict their access to OUR (not yours or locals) harbour,
163	Make the boat ramp a little easier at low tide.
164	Please increase parking and boating access. The plan is horrible for boaters and lovers of the water. My kids love a day out on the water. Sydney has a great harbor. Don't take away one of the great things about Sydney and ruin access to the best and most iconic harbor in the world. Your job is to improve not damage facilities and not ruin Australia.
165	Tunks Park is a great park that I love as it has everything there for the family. Don't destroy it by taking away boaters rights. More should be done for boat parking and better access to the boat ramp during all hours. The answer isn't to take it away. The answer is to improve services for all.
166	Please improve access to the water. The plan is making it worse or impossible to access the water. Something that is Un-Australian! Council is supposed to improve services and get people active and healthy. Not keep our kids on the TV and computer games. My family would much prefer to see improved facilities overall for everyone not just the minority of people.
167	As a regular user of Tunks Park boat ramp, I am quite disturbed to learn that I may have my access denied until 7 am and from 7pm. I would ask you to review this as I feel it is unfair and unreasonable. I would suggest that if council proceeds, they should also stop commercial vehicles, trucks, utes etc from using public roads in the area from 7pm to 7 am, for the same reasons as the ramp closure is proposed.
168	Disappointing that the council is just trying to make more money of our beautiful natural resource Sydney harbour by charging for parking.
169	I am more than happy for the work to be done to the park BUT NO LOCKING THE RAMP and don't reduce the parking as there is not enough parking as it is.
170	I use the boat ramp depending on weather almost weekly and I always launch the boat between 5-5:30 there are always plenty of other people doing the same as well as a number of kayakers getting out before work. If the gate is locked until 7:30 I will not be able to use my local boat ramp because I always need to launch the boat much earlier than 7:30. The kayaker going out before work will also not be able to use the ramp because they will not have enough time after 7:30.
171	I oppose the proposed work to Tunks park. I often use this ramp to access our beautiful Sydney harbour for a days fishing! We are well and truly on the water by the proposed opening time for the park. The boat ramp is situated so well on the harbour and if closed off would mean a congestion at other ramps around the harbour.
172	Please leave the ramp and facilities the way they are. It is a very safe ramp for launching the boat with my young children. Please limit the taps to work between daylight hours.
173	As a fisherman who uses the ramp regularly I find this outrageous.
174	Hi, I am greatly concerned and opposed at the proposed Tunks Park Masterplan and the implementation of parking restrictions for boat trailers that are proposed to be implemented. This is the only available boat ramp in the North Sydney Council and one of few in the harbour in general for myself and countless other boaters, and to propose to limit our ability for this to be readily accessible by imposing such a fee is absurd and should be ruled out immediately. I am also greatly opposed to the Curfews that are proposed to be implemented around the boat ramp. This dusk till dawn lock out of the boat ramp not only greatly limits the availability of the ramp at crucial times, but also proposes a great safety risk by not allowing access for people to retrieve their boats should they return after dark. This would mean boats would be left tied up in the limited docking zone overnight and cars and trailers would be left for longer durations. This is far more detrimental to the surrounding environment than the limited noise that may be caused as boats depart and arrive. This plan and the survey used to inform this plan is an example of a poorly thought out proposal that has only captured a small minority of respondents. This will have a detrimental affect on individuals, family's and businesses, all who rely on the boat ramp and parking facilities to allow access to the Most Spectacular Harbour in the world at all hours of the day. I trust you understand the above concerns raised by myself and shared by thousands of others and will scrap this proposal for something that involves proper community consultation. Any proposal should include for greater boat trailer parking and better access to the boat ramp. Yours Sincerely, Lifetime resident, rate payer, frustrated boater.
175	1. More trailer parking, not less.

	<p>2. Don't close the access road off Brothers Ave. The plan calls for the closure of the access road leading to the ramp from the south. This will only create chaos, conflict and safety issues at the ramp.</p> <p>3. Do something for the kayakers. Create a separate access point to the water for kayakers to the south of the ramp, along with a separate tap and wash area for them to wash their gear. This would ease congestion at the ramp.</p> <p>4. No lockouts. Residents are right to complain about late-night noise but the answer isn't to punish all law-abiding boaters with lockouts (p. 117 of the plan) and tap removals. Put the taps on timers and/or send the rangers down there at night to enforce existing regulations. Put signs at the ramp warning of fines for noise.</p> <p>5. No parking time limits. Imagine the chaos at midday, when the sports fields are busiest in winter, as everyone who launched at dawn comes back at the end of a 6-hour parking limit. What if engine trouble, poor weather or some other valid issue slows your return? Will the rangers cancel your parking fine?</p> <p>6. No paid parking. Paid trailer parking won't ease congestion as the main cause of congestion in the park precinct is people using the sports fields. And anyway, boaters have nowhere else to go in North Sydney. If paid parking is introduced, it should be reasonable and cognisant of the range of fees and charges which boat owners already pay.</p> <p>7. Build more boat ramps with trailer parking. Tunks Park ramp would not be such a highly utilised boating facility if North Sydney Council provided trailer parking at ramps such as Lavender Bay or Milsons Pt.</p>
176	<p>I saw no mention of this issue in the draft plan, and therefore request that this be considered. I walk in the park regularly. After rainfall, the southern sealed pathway through the length of the park is often completely covered by water in several sections. Unless you want to get your feet wet/muddy, you are forced to walk on the adjoining unsealed areas (grass or mud) which are often also wet/muddy and slippery. I would like to see the sealed pathway raised in those places which are often underwater, such that the sealed pathway remains uncovered by water regardless of recent rainfall.</p>
177	<p>The proposal ignores the significant use of the Tunks park ramp and pontoon by the Yachting and Boating community to access their yachts or motor Cruisers on their Private RMS Moorings in the bays of Southern Upper Middle Harbour through out the year, an area that extends as far as the spit to the east and Castlecrag /Cove to the North and all areas to the south.</p> <p>The use of the ramp and pontoon also extends to commercial Operators customers such as the Marina customers especially the aged and disabled customers who Cannot navigate the steep stairway access to boats on the marinas in the area Other than by way of tender services provided by the marinas (which They pay for in addition to Mooring fees.) The other users are the various trades that service waterfront housing and Other waterfront facilities. these users generally provide essential marine services 24/7. Other trades which include mooring, diving Hull cleaning and Marine survey services also use the ramp and pontoon.</p> <p>It is incorrect to assess the use of the ramp and pontoon as being limited to 'trailer boats'. Only There are a Myriad of Other users that use The ramp and pontoon. than there are 'soccer mums' on Winter Saturdays.</p> <p>The council should not encourage the intensified use of the area for 'soccer 'at the expense of all the other users which by and large are passive and not intrusive as the report suggests. The impact of junior soccer on the entire park area is excessive and appears to be intensified annually with more soccer teams participating. The park was never designed to cater for such a large single intensive use and such use should be curtailed or transferred elsewhere. The 'soccer teams that participate are drawn from districts outside the municipality. Consequently, the soccer organisers should distribute participation as there are alternative locations in and outside the municipality to allow for This.</p> <p>The boating community on the other hand. does not have that privilege or opportunity. Moorings allocations are strictly controlled by RMS .by way of a waiting list for applicants depending on the size of the vessel and the area available as a result of a surrender of an existing Berth. The fees to obtain a mooring are considerable and are in addition to the annual fee charged by RMS. The recreational yachtsman / boat Owners, their crew and guests require Parking for very lengthy periods 'Not just a few hours', occasionally for several hours or days When away. In accordance with the terms of their mooring license, which terms have restrictions on the period they vacate their mooring.</p> <p>As a user of this facility for over 50 years' I feel I'm qualified to say that as council has neither the Money, political Will, or intension to improve or expand boating facilities in the municipality whatsoever It should preserve this facility and the Lavender bay facility for maritime users as there are very few public facilities in the area or likely to be developed in the area.in the future for the boating /maritime community. On the Other hand, 'Land based sport can be allocated facility in many areas boating cannot.</p>

	<p>The proposed plan demonstrates however that additional parking can be created to the north/West of the existing ramp as that area has Little use for organised sport (Its mainly used by personal trainers) .and not for picnics as the report implies. I strongly object to this form of town planning that fails to take into account the original purpose and overall principal use of the area and the amenity it provides. 24/7 for the maritime community.</p>
178	<p>Neutral Bay, Ratepayer and Owner of 3 boats in this council area 2 of which are moored in Long Bay, the third is kept in a garage at a unit block in Neutral Bay. I spend in excess of 100 days on the harbour each year – all accessed via Tunks Park.</p> <p><u>Issue:</u> This submission seeks to highlight the lack of consideration shown in the Draft Tunks Park Plan of Management to the users of Tunks Park that rely upon its access to marine facilities, notably vehicular access, parking and boat ramp facilities. From reading the Draft dated July 2018 is it most evident that the focus of the report with respect to access and parking is solely aimed at enhancing those users with short term parking requirements, namely sporting and dog walking users and appeasing residents who bought near a facility and then seek to curtail the facilities activities to further their own utility as a home owner. It is also noted that access to marine facilities within the North Sydney Council has reduced considerably since the construction of Tunks Park. Many of the public wharves, jetties and ramps have been removed, fallen into a significant state of disrepair or simply access locked off, further concentrating the reliance on Tunks Park, the only usable public boating facility within the North Sydney Council area. Furthermore, while demand from the boating public has increased for facilities, competitive resource users have been also funnelled by Council into the limited area of Tunks Park with no expansion of parking for boating facility users or improving general access for the boating public. Note, the improvement funded by the state government (from what I understand, was also partly funded from the trust established from recreational fishing licence fees) some 8 years ago was only to the pontoon and ramp, not the general access to these facilities. Additionally, I challenge Council to find residents who have been there longer than the boat ramp. And as such who did not have any reason not to expect boat ramp activity or noise when acquiring their property.</p> <p><u>Awareness of the Draft Plan:</u> Please note that most of us who are regular users (like myself) of the facility know each other. We see each other most weekends. As users of the Facilities we would account for a very high proportion of those that park vehicles at Tunks Park. Most concerningly, it also appears that very few of this group are aware of this Draft Management Plan and the proposal of restricted use and parking times. I am at a loss as to why council has not sought to place signage at the Park for users to be made aware of the proposed changes/restrictions in order to gain full participation in the consultation process?</p> <p><u>Items of the Draft Plan contested:</u> <i>Timed parking:</i> The proposal for timed parking does not take into account the users who require long period parking. For those accessing a boat, 2-3 hours is not a feasible timeframe for the parking of a single vehicle. It is not feasible that we should park somewhere else due to the needs of carrying equipment and supplies. If we are launching a boat or a tender to access a boat, then proposed trailer parking of 6 hours is not a feasible timeframe especially as many boat trips are taken over a weekend by many vessel owners.</p> <p><i>Restricted boat ramp hours:</i> As an avid angler, generally launching before dawn, restricted hours of operation of a boat ramp are simply not practical or acceptable. Note: no other launching facilities are available within the area.</p> <p><i>Other Boat Ramp Access</i> In the Plan it notes that Council has a second boat ramp located at Lavender Bay. I am the only person I know who has attempted to launch a trailer boat from Lavender Bay. To claim it now as a ramp is preposterous. First, access to it by trailer is near impossible. Second, the ramp has not been maintained in a workable state. Third, there is no trailer parking available, and fourth, it is illegal given the traffic signage, to actually park a vehicle upon the ramp unless you are from Sydney Water's Maintenance Department!</p>

	<p><u>Wash down facilities:</u> Wash down facilities are a safety requirement. Maintenance of trailers and motors require hosing down and flushing. Modern outboard motors do not require to be run to facilitate flushing and older motors are increasingly rare amongst fishermen who would retrieve at time where noise would be an issue. The issue of engines running whilst being flushed will reduce in the coming years as motors are replaced. Further more if like me you keep your trailed vessel in a garage at a unit block (due in part to the restriction of on street parking introduced by Council then it is not possible to flush or wash your boat where it is kept. Similarly, I believe that this is also the case at the commercial storage facilities available in the nearby area.</p> <p><u>Background:</u> I am also a long term resident and rate payer of North Sydney Council having owned and lived here for many years. I am a user of the Park and use it regularly (generally 2 days a week). As an avid angler, I generally launch before dawn or some time the previous night. I use the Park for its boat launching facilities, trailer parking, wash down water taps, wharf and single vehicle parking. Outside of sporting facility users and dog walkers, I believe this is a common usage pattern of many of the users of the parking facilities located in the Park. In general, my parking requirement is for the whole day if not longer when staying overnight. I have used the Park in this manner in excess of 15 years. I often launch a tender (off a trailer) and park, to access one of the two boats I keep moored (on RMS private moorings) on the bay, especially when I stay overnight or need to transport equipment to or from them. When I do not use my own trailered tender, I park and catch a ride out to my moored craft from any one of the boats that are launched from the ramp – therefore I do not need a shore based tender to be left permanently shore side (noting that North Sydney Council sought to restrict the number of permits issued for shore side storage of tender craft several years ago). I am yet to encounter a refusal when someone is asked if they can drop me out. It is not feasible, given the movement of equipment required, to take public transport, shuttles or other modes of transport. Nor is it feasible to leave equipment shoreside whilst retrieving a vehicle a distance away as items are often stolen (as has occurred to me in the past). I access the Park at a variety of hours and witness it both busy and quiet, and often there for periods greater than 8 hours. In general, conflict is low, however you can always tell the new users for their lack of patience. Even in the peak period I have never had to wait more than 30 minutes to find a parking space (I have waited longer at a Westfield). Traffic to the area via access roads is often heavy, (but where isn't on a Saturday morning in Sydney?) yet generally well behaved. Obviously additional parking will alleviate the issues, however it would appear from the diagram that additional spots will also entail removal of existing ones – this does seem to be counterproductive. I understand how a resident in the immediate area may not like it, but as stated before, the facility outdates virtually every resident in the area – so I am sure the issues they see were there before they came. In general, most users of the facility are considerate of each other and the residents. There are the rare few that are not – but is that a reason to punish a section of the community and force them to lose their access? I strongly contest the need to have a time limit on parking, as the usage of boats is not a short scheduled event like a sporting fixture.</p>
179	<p><u>Option 1 & 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree with Option 1, 1-12 and Option 2, 1-14 Masterplan recommendations - Option 2 is preferred because of the grassed area adjacent to the water, rather than car parking, and it allows better access to the water and its proposed upgraded facilities that are proposed in both options <p><u>Exercise Equipment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No exercise equipment is mentioned in either Option 1 or 2, Why? <p><u>Conclusion:</u> When considering either Option, new exercise equipment should be reinstalled in a position to maximise use by the public</p> <p><u>Car Parking</u> Since car parking is at a premium, consider other options of getting patrons to use alternative ways of getting to the Park (other than by car), especially on sports days <u>Conclusion:</u> Some type of commuter buses arranged by NSC or one or two of the sporting bodies one or two days a week?</p> <p><u>Signage</u> Minimise the amount of unnecessary signage that is proliferating in the area</p>

180

First, I would like to thank the POM team and council for your commitment to addressing the problem of residents' loss of water views. This is very much appreciated by residents. Also council's reorganisation and rescheduling of Saturday sporting activities during the peak winter period has made a definite difference in alleviating traffic congestion in The Boulevard. 🙌🙌

Draft comments

3.5.2 -- cricket nets

Is it feasible to provide dark coloured practice nets which would blend in with the surroundings? They are made of metal and could be easily spray painted.

3.6.5 -- access to waters' edge

Any foreshore decking should be gently curved in design, stepped so as to follow the natural curve of the bay and be less intrusive on sight line from foreshore out to the water. Any decking or jetty should not extend too far out into the bay and intrude on natural outlook. The boat ramp is already a substantial structure projecting into the bay.

In the report you state there is insufficient canopy. There are canopy trees throughout the park that are still maturing and will provide more canopy in the future. Obviously, by their very nature sporting fields must always remain as open space and therefore shouldn't be included in the insufficient canopy equation. For passive users, this leaves little remaining space that has not been planted out with trees and shrubs.

The heavily wooded sides of Tunks Park already provide substantial canopy and any further planting in some areas of the park would create the following problems:

-
- Deteriorating grass quality throughout the park, especially in winter.
- Insufficient sunshine for sporting groups and onlookers during peak winter sports period.
- Insufficient sunshine and impeded views in and out of the park for passive recreation users.
- Further loss of water views for residents.

During the summer months (when there is less organised sporting activity) daytime users and onlookers utilise both sides of the ovals for shade where there are already, existing large trees. The very popular touch-footy teams play in the late afternoon early/evening period when shade is not an issue.


If the realignment of Brothers Avenue and car park relocation do not go ahead, then the northern side of the cricket oval currently containing exercise equipment and memorial trees could possibly be expanded and planted out with high canopy trees and shrubs.

Some of the low-growing native shrubs in full bloom along the foreshore area this spring were a delightful sight and more of these shrubs would be welcome.

Thank you all once more for allowing me to 'have my say'.

Attached are three photos projecting future impact at maturity of the current plantings along the foreshore.

The first photo shows the lovely open water view over Long Bay. This view is one of the very best views from the top of a unit block on the cliff above Tunks Park. Other residents' views in this block and in other units and homes around the perimeter of the park would vary significantly. Some have only water 'glimpses'.	The second photo below shows the future impact of numerous self-seeded casuarinas, creating a 'screen' along the edge of the bay. Also two Red Gums in the centre of foreshore (one right on the bank), two east side gums close to road near Mortlock reserve area, two gums (one memorial) on west side of Brothers Avenue. There are also numerous tall shrubs including six Coastal Banksias. Some of the gums making up the stand of tall trees on the south-west corner of no. 1 field appear to be still growing and are encroaching on water views as well.	The photo below projects the future view from the previous photo with addition of the most recent plantings of 4 Red Gums and 3 Coastal Banksias. Currently the foreshore area has 10 gums, 9 casuarinas and 6 Banksias still to reach maturity. There are also other tall shrubs which may still be growing.
---	---	--

	
181	<p>DRAFT TUNKS PARK PLAN OF MANAGEMENT SUBMISSION IN THE FORM OF AN OBJECTION</p> <p>From: President of the Boat Owners Association of NSW Inc. and his Management Committee</p> <p>The Boat Owners Association of NSW Inc. (BOA) was established in 1987 to represent the interests of boat owners in NSW. Whilst our constituency draws from all parts of the state, it is centred on the world-class recreational waterways of Sydney Harbour and Pittwater.</p> <p>Access to these waterways is a key issue as Sydney comes under increased pressure from a growing population. Our network of boat ramps is the means by which enjoyment of our Harbour is extended to stakeholders who cannot afford waterfront facilities of their own.</p> <p>The BOA is aware of a proposal currently before Council to modify usage of the Tunks Park Boat Ramp in a way that will reduce access to Sydney Harbour. Such a move is a serious step in the wrong direction, and one that appears to pay little regard for North Sydney's duty to provide public access to the Harbour. This is a duty that is unique to only a handful of Councils, and North Sydney must play its part.</p> <p>The facilities at and below Mean High Water Mark – funded in part by fees paid by our members – are of not much use to anyone if there is nowhere to park the car and trailer nearby. The Tunks Park Ramp is of regional importance to the boating community, and any changes arising from the new Plan of Management must respect this reality. We implore Council to properly weigh the content of our attached submission in the interests of equitable access to the Harbour.</p> <p>Tunks Park boat ramp is a facility of regional importance to Sydney boating families. North Sydney Council is obliged to keep it so.</p> <p><i>All stakeholders?</i></p> <p>It is clear from the PoM and the public outreach efforts so far that the council is not interested in the views of ramp users and has put little to no thought into how the boat ramp functions as a regional boating facility</p> <p><u>Executive Summary Recommendations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Council properly consults boating stakeholders and representative bodies like the Boat Owners Association NSW and reflects their views in its public plans (P. 3, Para 5) 2. That Council educates local residents about the importance of this regional facility to counter misperceptions (P.3, Para 6) and includes boating as a legitimate precinct activity (P. 5, Para 2; P. 6, Para 3a) 3. That the council works to provide more, not less, access to the waterways in the LGA for the boating community including as a high priority upgrading the ramps at Milson Park and Quibaree Park (P. 4, Para 5) 4. That Tunks must continue to function as a regional boat ramp with additional trailer parking and wash bays (P. 7, Para 1a; P. 9, Para 2b; P. 10, Paras 1 -3) 5. That boaters should not have to pay for trailer parking (P. 6, Para 3b; P8, Para 1) 6. The BOA strongly opposes any realignment of Brothers Ave that would result in a single access point to the ramp (P. 6 -7, Paras 1 -3)

7. That Council properly enforces existing rules around parking, night time noise and the disabling of public taps (P. 7, Para 1b; P. 9, Para 1)

8. That a separate launch and wash area for kayaks be created (P. 10, Para 2 -3)

Community Consultation 1.8, p.15 -16

1) Council claims it “adopted an inclusive approach to ensure all community and stakeholder voices and points of view were heard and understood ... The highest level of participation in the consultation program came from local residents with more limited participation from other stakeholder groups”.

a) The BOA note s that bodies such as the Boat Owners Association of NSW and the Recreational Fishing Alliance were not actively consulted and our members and non - member ramp users overwhelmingly tell us they were not consulted. How can this be the case if there was an “inclusive” approach and “all” stakeholder voices were heard, unless licence and registration fee -paying ramp users, plus business operators such as boat driving schools, diving clubs and charter fishers, are not deemed to be stakeholders?

2) “Many community members contest the amount of parking space and noise allowance that is given to boat and trailer users. This is particularly an issue for residents who hear noise very early in the morning and for sports ground users who do not have access to valuable parking spots during peak times on the weekend.”

a) The BOA note s that an anti -boating attitude is the inevitable consequence of this one -sided public consultation which excluded the boating community and delegitimised it as a stakeholder.

b) The BOA notes that there is no mention of the boating community's concerns about issues such as access and parking. The views of ramp users are absent from this summary, although Tunks Ramp is a state -funded facility of regional significance, as the council itself concedes (p. 83, 3.6.3).

c) The BOA notes the designation of Tunks as a regional facility in that it attracts “local and district visitors as well as a significant proportion of visitors from areas outside the municipality including both interstate and overseas tourists”. (North Sydney Council Report for Water Based Recreation Needs Study Report May 2006, p.17)

3) The BOA notes further grounds to doubt the findings of the council's online surveys and community consultations. The first online feedback survey did not include the ramp as an optional answer to the question "Which areas of the park do you mostly visit?" (see Appendix). Options for the question "What facilities do you value the most in Tunks Park?" did not include "boat ramp" or "jetty". A corrected version of the survey was subsequently uploaded and the council claims, without providing evidence, that this error did not adversely affect the data. The survey ran from November 3 to December 3 2017 and attracted twice as many female respondents (223) as male (107), for a very small total of 333 respondents. Judging by the proposals in the draft Plan of Management, boat owners did not participate and their perspectives were not sought despite the council's obligation to do so as the custodian of a regional boating facility funded in part with state licence and registration fees

4) The BOA notes that North Sydney Council held public workshops in Dec 2017 that attracted an insignificant total of 44 attendees, and heard "lots of blame on boat users for parking problems", according to council documents. We assume most of this handful of attendees were local residents who made the choice to live next to a boat ramp that has been there for many decades serving generations of Sydney boating families. Their complaints about boaters causing parking problems are one-sided. **Boaters are all too familiar with the sight of cars parked in trailer bays, often directly under the "trailers only" sign.** This forces boaters to park on side-streets, causing more unwarranted backlash against ramp users. That boaters are being singled out for blame for "parking Boat Owners Association of NSW Submission on Tunks Park 2018 3 problems" is more evidence that ramp users have not been properly consulted about the redevelopment proposals.

5) The BOA proposes the Council properly consults boating stakeholders and explicitly reflects their views in its public plans.

6) The BOA proposes Council educates local residents about the importance of this regional facility to counter the unwarranted targeting of boat-owning families for blame over parking and other issues that are not their fault.



Vehicle Access and Parking 2.7.3. p. 55

- 1) The BOA notes that Council claims there are 2 boat ramps in LGA. This is misleading. The other one at Quibaree Park, Lavender Bay, has no trailer parking and is therefore useless to all but people with roof-mounted, hand-portable water craft such as kayaks. Boaters have no alternative but to use Tunks Park and they require off-street parking spaces to do so.
- 2) The BOA notes the lack of boating infrastructure in the LGA despite the growing need to provide greater access to the waterways, Council's previous commitments to do so and opportunities to do so at locations such as Milson Park and Quibaree Park.
- 3) The BOA notes the following from North Sydney Foreshore Access Strategy 2007:
 - a) "North Sydney Council has identified the following vision for foreshore access: To promote and improve access links to the North Sydney foreshore for the local and wider community from both the land and the water to continue sustainable use and enjoyment of Sydney Harbour as a unique waterfront environment. Fundamental to North Sydney's vision is that provision of access is enhanced both in quantitative terms (as in extent of access) and in qualitative terms (in relation to recreational, visual, and environmental values)." (2.0, p. 5, The Access Vision)
 - b) "Boating access to the water is an important use that needs to be supported by specialised facilities such as boat ramps and storage facilities." (2.4, p. 17, Facilities)
 - c) "Limited physical access to the water" is a "pressure" on foreshore use. (5.2.1, p.56, Pressures)
- 4) The BOA notes the following from previous council reports and consultations:
 - a) The "construction of new public boat ramps" was proposed in Sharing Sydney Harbour Access Plan 2003 but none has been constructed in the North Sydney Council LGA in the past 15 years despite increased demand due to population growth and the council's promises to improve access to waterways.
 - b) Of the 2 recommendations for boat ramp improvements/additions at Tunks Park contained in North Sydney Council Report for Water Based Recreation Needs Study Report May 2006, those being better beach access for kayak launching and a "user pays boat washing facility", neither has been provided by the date of writing 15 years later. Indeed, in May 2018 the taps at Tunks Ramp were removed and the Plan of Management refers to the permanent removal of the taps.
 - c) The North Sydney Council Report for Water Based Recreation Needs Study Report May 2006 states provision of "ancillary facilities such as fish cleaning benches and boat wash down bays, commencing with high use regional sites but eventually extending LGA wide ", should be investigated as a high priority (p.39).
- 5) The BOA propose s the council provides more, not less access to the waterways in the LGA for the boating community to ease pressures at Tunks Park, as recommended over many years of previous study and consultation.

- a) Consider as a high priority upgrading the ramps at Milson Park and Quibaree Park to provide trailer parking and washing facilities including taps and washing bays. This would alleviate demand at Tunks Park.
- b) Maintain Tunks Ramp as a functional regional boating facility with sufficient parking, washing bays and taps.

Park Use 2.8, p. 57

- 1) The BOA notes that no mention is made here of the boat ramp or its vital importance to Sydney's boating infrastructure
- 2) The BOA propose s that boating is recognised as a legitimate park activity alongside dog - walking etc.

Wayfinding 2.8.6, p. 62

- 1) The BOA support s moving these signs closer to the ramp with more explicit warnings about noise. The green sign at the western end of the parking area (**see photo**) should be moved next to the ramp.

Informal Community Use 3.5.4, p. 72

- 1) The BOA note s that there is already sufficient foreshore open space for informal recreational use and this should not be expanded at the expense of a regionally significant and state -funded boat ramp.



Access "Key Issues" 3.6.1, p. 74

- 1) The BOA notes that the "requirement for boat ramp users to transport their boat via car and trailer ... requires parking" and trailer parking is recognised as a "key" requirement.
- 2) The BOA notes "high parking demand resulting in an overflow of parking on surrounding residential streets and misuse of parking within Brothers Avenue carpark and surrounding residential streets".
- a) Limiting trailer spaces will only exacerbate this problem.
- 3) "The community consultation forums identified a high level of local resident concern with the impacts of boat trailer parking in particular during peak use times but also at weekends generally." (p.77)
- a) See point 6 under "Community Consultation" above. The BOA suggests the community needs to be educated about the regional significance of the ramp, the lack of alternatives for boaters, the ramp's history as a much -loved and highly utilised feature of the LGA, and the requirements of trailer parking as a "key" access issue.
- b) "Demand exceeds supply in terms of available boat parking which is exacerbated by the fact that boat parking is free albeit time limited".
- i) The BOA notes that making boaters pay will not alter demand as they have no alternatives in the LGA. It will be viewed by the boating community as a fee - gouging by the council.
- ii) The BOA proposes that if boaters have to pay for parking then everyone should have to pay as boaters are not the main cause of congestion in the park precinct.



Brothers Avenue Realignment 3.6.3, p. 81

1) "It is proposed that Brothers avenue could be realigned to relocate general vehicle parking to west side of Brothers Avenue adjoining field No. 1."

a) The BOA notes that trailer vehicles need somewhere to queue while they wait their turn to launch/retrieve vessels. Figure 6.2 of the Travel Plan (p.34 -35) says a "turning bay will be required for boat trailers to access the boat ramp". The design shows the turning bay in the current wash bay area. There appears to be no provision here for a wash bay at all.

i) The BOA proposes that if the realignment must take place, provision be made for a separate wash bay and turning bay. This may require a significant extension of the proposed turning bay with the loss of some of the additional "open space" created by the realignment, or a through road off Brothers Ave to provide a second means of access to the ramp as currently exists.

b) The BOA notes that reducing access to the ramp area to a single point will create significant problems for trailers, as they will have to enter the ramp area and travel through those waiting to launch/retrieve in order to turn in the designated turning bay. This seems like a recipe for chaos and conflict. Currently trailers enter via the parking lot in Mortlock Reserve and wait there in a queue, then turn left into the wider trailer parking area where they can reverse back into the ramp. How will they be able to queue and turn to reverse down the ramp if they are all entering and leaving via a single access point at the west? This is sacrificing the functionality of a regional boat ramp for the highly questionable benefit of creating unnecessary additional "open space" for informal community use.

2) The BOA propose s further study of this proposal to determine its impact on the safe and efficient functioning of the ramp, keeping in mind "Tunks Park boat ramp is a regional facility, and any actions must be consistent with it remaining as such" (p.83). a) The realignment has the effect of swapping 3 trailer parking spaces, a wash bay and a second ramp area access point for "open space". Surely there is already enough "open space" in the area. Trailer parking and access needs to be increased, not reduced, at this regional boating facility.

3) The BOA strongly oppose s any realignment of Brothers Ave that has the effect of cutting access to the ramp or limiting its ability to function smoothly and safely as a regional facility including adequate trailer parking, wash bay and taps.

Parking 3.6.3, P. 82/110

1) "There are limited restrictions to the use of existing parking and the anecdotal perspective of park usage is that the restrictions that are present are not regularly enforced. As such the already limited parking resource is placed under further pressure."

a) The BOA notes and support s this acknowledgement that better enforcement of parking is required, and propose s this also includes those who illegally park in trailer bays.

b) The BOA proposes stricter enforcement of rules around night time noise and the persistent, deliberate disabling of the taps at the ramp by local residents.
Trailer Parking P. 83

1) "There is a high level of local resident concern with the impacts of boat trailer parking in particular during peak use times but also at weekends generally. However, the Tunks Park boat ramp is a regional facility, and any actions must be consistent with it remaining as such."

a) The BOA proposes that Tunks must continue to function as a regional facility. Due to increasing demand and the absence of any alternatives on the entire North Shore of Sydney Harbour, it should be expanded with additional trailer parking and wash bays. Any reduction in parking or washing facilities will reduce the ramp's ability to remain a regional facility. There is ample room in the precinct to create additional parking for everyone.

b) The BOA notes that there is a "high level of concern" among ramp users about the impact of cars parking in trailer spots during peak times. This is not recognised in the draft PoM. which unfairly attributes blame to boaters. We can provide multiple photos of cars in trailer spaces directly under Trailers Only signs.

Summary of parking measures to be investigated & other suggestions P. 84

1) The BOA notes that 5 of 6 options are for paid weekend trailer parking. How will this improve access? Boaters have NO ALTERNATIVE in the LGA and cannot take public transport to the area like users of the sports fields, as trailer parking is a requirement of ramp use. This sounds like a money -grab from boaters and will do nothing to resolve the underlying parking issues. It will also exacerbate street parking issues in the area (Travel Plan p.32).

a) The BOA oppose s paid permits for trailers (Travel Plan p.32) . Are boaters meant to pay for annual permits to use every ramp in NSW? This could add up to significant costs as boaters use a variety of ramps in various waterways and cannot be expected to pay for annual permits at each one on top of their boating fees.

b) The BOA oppose s taking trailer parking for bus parking. Given the proposed loss of trailer parking due to the realignment of Brothers Ave for the benefit of sports field users and "open space", boaters should not have to lose further spaces for bus parking. (Travel Plan p.30, 32)

c) The BOA notes the loss of 3 spaces for the realignment and 2 spaces for buses would equate to a 17% cut to trailer parking at Tunks and would not be consistent with the council's obligation to maintain this as a regional facility. It is also unfair given council's own research shows boat trailers are not the cause of the parking problems, rather it is the volume of people using the sports fields at peak times.

d) "To reduce traffic congestion near to the park, efforts must be taken to reduce the total volume of vehicles travelling to the park." (Travel Plan p.28) The BOA notes the bottom line is boat owners have NO ALTERNATIVE in the LGA, so the emphasis must lie on reducing the volume of non -trailer traffic to the precinct.

e) The BOA oppose s any proposal to build a multi -storey parking structure in trailer parking area. (PoM p.84)

f) The BOA support s further staggering the use of the sports field to reschedule some matches to Saturday afternoon and Sunday to ease pressure on peak winter Saturday mornings. (Travel Plan p.34) Make greater use of alternative fields such as Primrose Park.

g) The BOA propose s use of shuttle buses and greater encouragement of carpooling as a condition of club sports field use at peak times. Current carpool rate of 1.2 players per car (Travel Plan, p. 25) is very low, basically showing there is no carpooling. Council should educate local sports teams about this and invest in some shuttle buses to be paid for by metered car parking (not trailer parking).

Boat Ramp and foreshore access 3.6.4, p. 81 -84

1) "Residents in the community workshop forums identified that after dark noise through engine cleaning is a regular disruption to local amenity. The presence of potable water taps in the vicinity of the boat ramp which are used by boat users has been identified as the major root cause of the noise complaints."

a) The BOA notes that this is false logic. The taps are not the "major root cause" of noise complaints. Misuse of the taps is the cause. The taps should stay for the benefit of the vast majority of responsible ramp users who need them to wash their engines, kayaks or diving gear during the day, as is consistent with the typical and uncontroversial functioning of a "regional" ramp.

b) The BOA supports proposal to "improve regulatory signage".

c) The BOA supports proposal for rangers to "enforce regulations relating to boat ramp use", esp. night time noise. Many of these issues would go away with proper enforcement of existing rules.

i) Noise can be limited through timing of the taps or better enforcement of noise rules, such as video surveillance and ranger visits during peak after -dark periods.

d) The BOA oppose s any limit to ramp operating hours (P. 117). This would be a draconian and completely unnecessary response to a problem of enforcement of rules around noise.

e) The BOA notes that vandalism of the taps is an ongoing and serious issue that requires better enforcement.

	<p>2) Review with RMS “long -term sustainability of water availability and use” at the ramp in relation to water quality and “reducing potable water use”. “If water use is to be maintained seek to connect to harvested water / recycled water supply to reduce potable water use.”</p> <p>a) The BOA oppose s any removal of water access. Water use is part of the typical and uncontroversial functioning of a “regional” ramp and is not waste. Clean fresh water is required for washing equipment and flushing engines. The removal of water access should not be a consideration.</p> <p>b) The BOA proposes the creation of a dedicated washing bay which is not in the way of people coming to/from the ramp/trailer parking area. The washing bay should be large enough for a car and trailer to park and close (10m) to at least one functioning tap with clean fresh water.</p> <p><u>Foreshore Open Space 3.6.5, P. 85</u></p> <p>1) Facilities at the regionally significant, RMS -funded boat ramp such as parking, turning areas and washing areas should not be sacrificed for the sake of creating additional “open space” where sufficient open space already exists alongside multiple sports fields. The cost/benefits of this are highly questionable from the point of view of the main users of the park, ie sports players and boaters/kayakers.</p> <p>a) The BOA propose s instead that some of the abundant open space that already exists in the area should be used to create more parking for everyone including ramp users. b) The BOA oppose s creating foreshore open space next to an often foul -smelling, mud beach, storm -water drains and oyster -covered rocks. Better use of this area would be to convert it into additional parking and vehicle access.</p> <p>2) The BOA proposes a second and dedicated washing bay with a tap for kayaks and portable gear like wet suits etc. This would enhance ramp efficiency and stop conflicts over access to the washing area between boaters and other ramp users who do not necessarily need to park a trailer in the washing bay. This could be achieved simply with a 5x3m grassed area and a tap with signage a little to the south of the current boat wash area.</p> <p>This would also provide something for kayak users in the absence of any other proposal for the benefit of this growing cohort of visitors. (PoM p.85)</p> <p>3) The BOA proposes the creation of a dedicated launching area for kayaks to the south of the ramp, consisting of stone steps leading into the water from the foreshore, and marked with signage.</p>
182	<p>My family and I are pleased and gratified to note that council will be considering removal of some foreshore trees. This will help this area from gradually becoming overshadowed during the cooler months of the year when my family enjoy the sunshine and views out onto the bay. Also the lovely lawn space would have been ruined with grass unable to grow well. There should be a clear lawn zone on the foreshore where people are not hampered by park furniture or plantings.</p> <p>My children, husband, and I are all involved with sporting groups using Tunks Park. We have never been bothered by insufficient tree cover. If anything, because of all the tall trees on both the steep sides of the park the sun takes a while to warm up the fields and it is sunshine we are yearning for!</p>
183	<p>My wife and I moved to our apartment in Cammeray about 5 years ago. We moved from our long term, six-bedroom, family home in Mosman to this apartment mainly because of the outlook of park land, forest headland and most specially, water views.</p> <p>I have a great fear that we are losing our valued water views due to natural growth and possible Council plans for the Tunks Park area.</p> <p>The purpose of this email is to object strongly to plans the Council may have regarding Tunks Park.</p> <p>In doing so I wish to also make the following comments:</p> <p>We have enough large trees. Any new trees should be of low growth and the large trees blocking residents’ views should be removed.</p> <p>Perhaps some shade is needed for sports watchers, but the trees for such shade do not have to be high growers.</p>



	<p>The planting of further trees will further hinder the growth of grass on the sporting fields and surrounding areas. These trees will soak up a lot of moisture needed by the grass areas.</p> <p>Surely it is the Councils responsibility to take note of the concerns of Council residents above those who may occasionally visit Tunks Park for a picnic or sport watching. In fact, picnic people usually bring their own shade if necessary when visiting. Most come for the sun anyway.</p> <p>As for another wharf/jetty. One is enough. The present jetty and slip way serves the users well enough. I know ...I have a boat on a mooring in the Bay.</p> <p>SO, please plan carefully for Tunks Park, with the essential consideration of the local residents..... after all we are the ones who pay the rates and vote the Council members.</p> <p>I am unsure how many residents of my apartment block have forwarded a message such as this.... but I can report that everyone in our Strata block is very concerned with the loss of views and the expenditure of monies on plans that are not necessary.</p> <p>My wife and I look forward to the Councils consideration of our concerns, and the appropriate action.</p>
184	<p>I have read with interest the above-mentioned plan and would like to submit the following for consideration in relation to such. Our area of interest at Tunks Park lies with the boat ramp and provided trailer parking facilities.</p> <p>Boat launching facilities, like those at Tunks Park are in high-demand in Sydney, where there are not enough facilities of its quality as it is. Restrictions on access to and use of this facility would place further pressure on other facilities across Sydney</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would fully support measures to increase the efficiency of usage of the boat ramp, wharves and parking facilities. Removal of the “wash-down” tap and facility completely would be one way to free up space and have traffic move more freely around the area. I’ve frequently seen a queue of boats waiting to use the tap, with the expected resultant congestion. Boats parking next to the tap can also restrict traffic flow considerably. • Ideally add more boat trailer only parking spaces, closer to the water’s edge. When its busy down there, it can take a long trip up the north side, over the bridge and back down the south side again if you’ve had to park up the hill on Brothers Ave or Lower Cliff Ave. This delay then flows onto boats queueing for the wharf space, and then others waiting for the ramp. • Enforce the existing parking restrictions reserving parking spaces for cars with boat trailers only, especially on busy days where there is a lot of sport on the playing fields. Cars being more manoeuvrable can more easily park on Brothers/Lower Cliff Ave than a car with a trailer. I frequently see trailer spaces filled with one car, with no trailer... • Time limits on parking in existing boat trailer spaces adjacent to the wharf, and vigorous enforcement of such. Ensure the time limit is reasonable so someone can go out on their boat overnight or for a few days, but not leave a rusty trailer in a spot there for weeks! • A one-way traffic system in and out of Tunks Park would make everything a bit easier too. Having all cars flowing in one direction means less delays whilst cars with trailer have to manoeuvre out of the way of each other, in opposite directions, or avoid (sometimes) impatient car drivers. • Enforcement of late-night noise restrictions by council would effectively modify boater behaviour. • Discuss with RMS the use of more “better boating” program funding to increase the size of the floating pontoon wharf. This way more cars can be moving in and out of parking and people can get out of each other’s way quicker. <p>I would welcome the chance to engage with council on this Plan of Management, and would be more than happy to discuss any of the above, or to provide and sort of consultation the council may seek on the matter.</p> <p>I have used the facility regularly (several times per month) over the last 12 years as part of delivering our training courses and would be more than happy to provide any sort of assistance to council in developing their plan where appropriate.</p>
185	<p>On behalf of Cricket NSW (CNSW), I commend North Sydney Council (‘Council’) for your work in developing the draft Plan of Management/Masterplan for Tunks Park (‘the Masterplan’). CNSW appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback and looks forward to being a constructive partner in the development of the Masterplan.</p> <p><u>Cricket in the North Sydney Local Government Area (LGA)</u></p> <p>Cricket has a significant presence in the North Sydney LGA with approximately 2,861 participants recorded in the 2017/18 season (see Attachment A for full breakdown) and a total local economic contribution of \$3.4 million per annum. As the population of the North Sydney LGA – and hence cricket-playing population – continues to diversify and grow, so will the demand for well-planned and designed cricket facilities.</p>

	<p>Cricket is experiencing rapid growth in female participation, far outstripping population growth. The success of the Women's Big Bash League competition has also resulted in rapid growth in female participation and we expect this growth will continue, placing further pressure on sporting facilities across North Sydney.</p> <p><u>Draft Masterplan</u></p> <p>The draft Masterplan provides a unique opportunity to deliver cricket facilities and infrastructure for both the current and growing needs of the North Sydney LGA identified above. CNSW recognises Tunks Park as an important community facility and meets the facility design requirements to host local cricket events. It will be a community asset that the whole of the local community has access to including local junior (clubs affiliated to the North Shore Junior Cricket Association, including North Sydney District Junior Cricket Club) and senior (North Sydney District Cricket Club and the North Shore Cricket Association) cricketers.</p> <p>To further facilitate the growth of cricket as discussed above, we commend Council's consideration of an outdoor synthetic practice facility (in accordance with Cricket Australia's (CA) Community Cricket Facility Guidelines) to complement the existing outdoor playing facilities onsite as part of the draft Masterplan. However, CNSW understands that Council has been unable to determine an acceptable location due to the following issues: resident concern about noise, provision of adequate run-up length, distance from parking and impacts of fencing on circulation. We would like to work with Council and other local stakeholders to resolve the issues relating to noise and circulation as identified during the detailed master planning process. 1 Cricket NSW Facility Needs Analysis – Commissioned by SBP, June 2016</p> <p>I also understand that a complementary submission will be made by North Sydney District Junior Cricket Club.</p>
186	<p>Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the Tunks Park Draft Plan of Management. NSDJCC's submission is set out in the paragraphs below. It primarily responds to section 3.5.2 of the draft Plan.</p> <p>ABOUT THE NSDJCC</p> <p>NSDJCC is the junior cricket club for boys and girls residing in the North Sydney locality. The majority of children who play cricket for NSDJCC live within the North Sydney Local Government Area (LGA).</p> <p>Currently NSDJCC provides the following opportunities for juniors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Junior Blaster skills programme for 4-7-year-old (boys and girls). • Under 8 Master Blaster programme (boys and girls) and a separate programme for girls only. • Competition cricket from Under 9 to Under 17 (boys and girls). <p>NSDJCC has enjoyed considerable growth in recent years, with participation increasing from 399 (including 53 girls) in 2013-14 to 550 (including 70 girls) in 2017-18. Recent Cricket Australia mandated changes to junior cricket formats has resulted in an increase in the number of NSDJCC teams in the North Shore competition – with 27 teams playing competition cricket, plus Junior and Master Blaster groups. This creates challenges for us to find suitable training and match day locations within and around the North Sydney LGA.</p> <p>HOW NSDJCC USES TUNKS PARK</p> <p>At present, NSDJCC usage of Tunks Park on Saturdays in the spring and summer months is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synthetic wicket 5 is used from 8am to 6pm • Synthetic wickets 2 and 3 are used from 1pm to 6pm <p>On Saturdays these grounds – as well as synthetic wicket 4 – are also used by other local cricket clubs, both for junior and senior competitions. The turf wicket (Ground 1) is used by North Sydney District Cricket Club throughout spring and summer, for cricket matches forming part of the Sydney Cricket Association (NSW Premier Cricket) fixtures. In addition, all grounds at Tunks Park are used casually by local residents and others for social cricket during the spring and summer months. Tunks Park is not made available to us by North Sydney Council to be booked for training during the week.</p> <p>CRICKET NETS</p> <p>NSDJCC has participated actively throughout the consultation process for the draft Plan, with the primary objective of persuading Council to make provision for a synthetic nets facility at Tunks Park, as part of the draft Plan. We are very disappointed that this has not resonated with Council to date, particularly given the very limited nets facilities currently available across the North Sydney LGA.</p> <p>Cricket nets enjoy wide usage in the warmer months in parks right across Sydney, drawing both organised cricket (senior and junior club use) and casual users. Despite this, the North Sydney LGA at present has only five nets in total – two nets at St Leonards Park, two at Primrose Park, and one at Anderson Park. As</p>

recognised in the draft Plan, there are currently no nets located at Tunks Park, despite its long history of cricket use, and no nets at the following other junior cricket venues within the North Sydney LGA: Waverton Park and Forsyth Park.

In contrast, other North Shore LGAs have taken steps to accommodate the demand for synthetic nets – for example, in 2017 Mosman Council installed 9 synthetic nets at Balmoral Oval.

For boys and girls junior cricket to continue to thrive in the North Sydney LGA, it is critical that additional nets be provided in local parks, including at Tunks Park. At present, due to the lack of nets, many of our teams must resort to training at locations outside of the North Sydney LGA.

The draft Plan provides a great opportunity to significantly enhance local cricket net facilities in the North Sydney LGA for future generations – but this opportunity has unfortunately not been addressed in the current version. As a sporting location which accommodates cricket at all levels, Tunks Park is well placed to meet this key Council pre-condition in the provision of cricket facilities (as noted by Council in section 3.5.2 of the draft Plan, and also in the separate planning process for Anderson Park). We understand that Council's position regarding the development of cricket nets, is based on the following reasoning contained in section 3.5.2:

However, the POM process has been unable to determine an acceptable location due to:

- Local resident concern about noise (all)
- Provision of run in (3)
- Distance from parking (5,6)
- Impact of fencing on circulation (1)

NSDJCC urges Council to reconsider inclusion of a nets facility in the draft Plan. The concerns about noise are unfounded – noting that:

(1) Each proposed net location is well away from local residences.

(2) In any case, the noise generated from the use of a few practice nets is considerably less than that generated by Saturday morning soccer, and is no different to the many other low impact casual uses of the park (e.g. children's play area). The installation of cricket nets at Tunks Park will not 3 raise noise levels beyond what is reasonably expected for a public recreational area, or raise noise levels above those that occur presently.

(3) Nets are not intensively used, for long periods at a time. They are also not used at night, and do not require floodlighting.

If necessary, we would be happy to work further with Council to carry out a study to assess possible noise emissions, to provide guidance on potential subjective impacts at the nearest residential receivers.

In addition, we consider that the other issues highlighted in 3.5.2 can all be managed (as part of a process where an acceptable balance is achieved between different uses):

- Given the paucity of cricket nets in the LGA, NSDJCC does not consider distance from parking to be an issue. The cricket community would rather have nets located towards the western end of the park (just as we have to walk from parking areas to Tunks Park No. 4 or 5 on match days for games) rather than no nets at all – if this is the preferred location that best enables balancing of the various other interests with the park, then we would accept it
- We do not consider there is an issue with the provision of run-in highlighted for location 3. Given the nets would not be used for team training sessions while there is a game in progress, any overlap between run-ins for nets and the cricket ground itself is easily managed – as is the case at many other cricket grounds around Sydney
- From NSDJCC's perspective, a location within close proximity of the existing turf playing wicket at Tunks Park would be most preferred – whether this is location 1 or the previous preferred location to the north of the ground – but as noted above in the interest of balancing the needs of different stakeholder we would accept a more westerly location. As such, NSDJCC urges Council to give further consideration to this outdoor practice net facility, which is genuinely needed, and may be accommodated within an under-utilised part of the park.

CRICKET NSW SUBMISSION

A separate submission regarding the draft Plan has been made to Council by Cricket NSW and NSDJCC supports and endorses that submission. *** Once again, we thank Council for the opportunity to provide this submission. We would be pleased to discuss it further with Council, if required.

187	<p>NSW DPI (Fisheries)</p> <p><u>Recreational Fishing</u></p> <p>The Tunks Park boat ramp is a popular district launch facility and is regularly used by recreational boats and fishers, commercial operators (charter boats) and our fisheries compliance vessels.</p> <p>DPI Fisheries supports the existing access arrangements at the boat ramp and objects to closing the ramp between 10pm and 7am. Rather, DPI supports the implementation of responsible fisher education programs and implementing other management solutions to respond to the issues surrounding the use of the boat ramp. It is understood community members have raised concern about boat noise (flushing engines) late at night. The removal of wash down taps or a system on a timer restricted to daylight hours for example would be a better management tool than restricting access times i.e gates etc.</p> <p>Our recreational fishing stakeholders routinely express concern about the lack of boat trailer parking in Sydney Harbour so reductions to existing trailer parking spaces at Tunks Park will further exacerbate this issue and negatively impact on recreational boat users. DPI Fisheries also raises concern with how closing the ramp at 10pm will impact on fishers and boaters where unforeseen incidents occur (ie break downs) and boaters are unable to return to the boat ramp before the ramp is closed. The focus of the draft Plan to significantly alter existing accessibility of the boat ramp is not supported by Fisheries, nor is excessive costs of weekend trailer parking with time limits. Instead, we welcome the opportunity to work with Council to investigate fairer and equitable access arrangements.</p> <p>Sydney Harbour is one of the most popular recreational fishing locations in New South Wales due to the Harbour's accessibility and excellent fishing opportunities. Recreational fishing contributes \$3.4 billion to the State's economy each year. Tunks Park is a regional facility that should be accessible to all. It would be great to see Council promoting the socioeconomic and health benefits of recreational fishing in the local area. In support of this, DPI could assist Council in holding fishing workshops at Tunks Parks that would promote responsible fishing practices and provide the local community with some information on the positive influence recreational fishing can have on communities.</p> <p><u>Aquatic Ecosystems</u></p> <p>Fisheries is supportive of the proposal to partially 'day-light' the piped creek line to encourage natural habitat regeneration and provide a focal point for community interaction and aesthetic value.</p> <p>If the 'day-lighting' of the piped creek is not feasible for economic reasons, Fisheries recommends improving the aquatic habitat of the currently open creek to create a natural filtration system that improves water quality. A natural filtration system of reeds and aquatic vegetation would assist in stripping silt from the water column before it reaches the culverts and reduce sediment deposition at the culvert outfalls.</p> <p>Fisheries encourages the restoration of native vegetation along Flat Rock Creek (Action 1.9).</p> <p>Fisheries encourages the introduction of native vegetation to the harbour foreshore (Action 1.12).</p> <p>Please note DPI's Policy 4.3.1 for managing weirs and dams: 'weirs that are no longer providing significant benefits to the owner or user shall be removed'. Please consider whether the weir is still providing significant benefit to Council.</p> <p>Consider installing snags (fallen trees, including the root ball) in the creek to slow flow and create aquatic habitat instead of the weir.</p> <p>If the weir is to remain in place, the fish by-pass needs to be addressed. The purpose of a fish by-pass is to facilitate fish passage. Regardless of its terrestrial habitat value, the fish by-pass must remain fit for purpose. Permanent access ways (e.g. terracotta pipes) should be provided at various depths to ensure fish passage is facilitated at all water levels and flow conditions. Please refer DPI Fisheries 'Why do fish need to cross the road' (attached).</p> <p>Please also refer to Section 4.3 of the DPI Policies and Guidelines for Fish Habitat Conservation and Management (attached). These provide information on improving fish passage.</p> <p>Council will need to contact Fisheries to discuss potential dredging of sediments around the outfall of the culverts. S200 permits may apply.</p> <p>DPI Fisheries requires additional details on the proposed foreshore decking. We'd prefer not to deck over intertidal habitat, as per DPI policies and guidelines (attached), as there are colonies of oysters and other invertebrates that utilise this habitat and would be impacted by permanent shading. However, decking over the outfall pipe may be fine.</p>
188	Object to the proposal to limit access to the boat ramp.
189	Don't lock us out of the boat ramp.

190	<p>RE: Tunks Park Parking Strategy- Page 82 Onwards</p> <p>I have read the Tunks Park Management plan which I must say is very complete. I have used Tunks Park for the past 20 years to exercise, walk my dog daily and access our boat as a customer of Cammeray Marina.</p> <p>My submission refers to the parking arrangements and proposed management. Thank you for the time to consider my opinion.</p> <p>My points are-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The parking at Tunks Park mostly works for everyone concerned. Yes, on summer weekends there are demands upon the parking spaces, but not so during the week. My simple suggestion is to expand parking to take in the space of the existing fitness area and leave all other parking the same. This would be a least cost option and provides the maximum benefit. The fitness area parking could have tuff artificial grass (or green similar) and need only be open on the weekend to cope with car overflow. The fitness equipment could be slightly relocated. Everything would still look green. <p>I have never seen any friction of any kind displayed by any drivers in search of a car space. This term, I believe, is misused in the report to convey a sense of animosity and aggressions between drivers. This does not exist in my opinion of 20 years with 10 visits to the park each week.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General boating users who do not have a trailer would, as I read the proposal, be restricted to three hours. Its simply not possible to go on anyone's boat or make use of your own boat for 3 hours during the day. I would suggest a "Moored Boat Owners" sticker, renewable every year to differentiate these users on the weekend. - The idea to have North Sydney residents parking at peak times is good, however again restricts guests visiting boats. (See above). - There are minimal numbers of cars using the carpark overnight and I do not see this as an issue any time into the foreseeable future. - There are some trailers with/without boats that continually use the car designated spots. This should be stopped. - Motorcyclists also take up one car space each. There should be a designated motorcycle area. - With regards to Saturday and Sunday usage of the park, surely the entire park can be made more available for sporting activities across the main part of the day. There are still vacant time slots. District Cricket with 22 players plus officials on the main oval takes up a HUGE number of car spaces for hours each day. I would suggest that during summer it's the cricket players that are causing the greatest issues and hence a call to revise parking. It is the cricket players who need to pool their cars, not single families. Perhaps a cricket carpool with limited allocate car spots might work. - The fish cleaning centre and engine flush tap should be removed. Fish can be cleaned at home and engines can be flushed elsewhere. - It is a boat ramp and should be used as such. I do not see local residents concerns (living on the water) as major. It's a result of their environment where they live and I'd suggest the boat ramp has been there longer than most living residents. - Charging for boat/trailer time on weekends will not solve any issues. There are too few boat launching ramps in Sydney. Reducing the number of trailer spaces will reduce the ability of Sydneysiders to access the harbour. <p>To summarise, there is no need to reduce the car parking or restrict it greatly during weekends. My suggestion is to expand by using artificial turf (or similar surface) the parking near the fitness area which could be used for overflow on busy weekends. The proposals in the report are to the detriment of the moored boat owners and their guests.</p>
191	<p>Bay Precinct & Save Tunks Park: We congratulate North Sydney Council and the Consultants on the draft plan. Throughout the planning process, the consultants have given us the opportunity to express our views. Much of what we have advocated has been incorporated into the plan.</p> <p>Most people in our community like the Park the way it is and support its balance between passive and active recreation.</p> <p><u>Imperatives for the Future of Tunks Park</u> - We believe two imperatives are vital to protect this community asset for future generations. In this Executive Summary, we are emphasising these matters to ensure they receive appropriate attention ongoing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognise the role Tunks Park plays in nurturing and protecting Sydney's natural flora and fauna: Floodlighting to enable sport at night and the associated noise is a terminal threat to nesting, foraging, reproduction and sleep of protected and other fauna in Tunks Park. Protection of fauna and floodlighting are mutually exclusive – there can be no protection of fauna if the park is floodlit. - Recognise the constraints of Tunks Park's topography: We were advised that vehicular traffic management into and out of the Park is outside of the remit of this plan. However, increased usage of the park means increased traffic, and it is unrealistic to force more traffic of any kind onto the access roads.



Tunks Park – A Vision

Plans evolve from a vision. Bay Precinct and the Save Tunks Park Group believe that it is essential to develop a vision for Tunks Park. We have chosen to promote a vision entitled “Tunks Park: A Vision” to encapsulate the views of our communities.

Most of the constraints and opportunities identified in the planning process to date derive directly from extraordinary physical setting of the Park.

Tunks Park occupies the deep gully of Flat Rock Creek at the head of Long Bay. It is unusual among other landfill-gully parks such as Anderson Park and Primrose Park for its extent. It also links extensive natural forest along the Middle Harbour foreshore at Northbridge and the largely intact forested areas of Flat Rock Creek. Tunks is a fundamentally different type of public open space from the ridge-top parks such as Cammeray Park, St Leonards Park, Northbridge Park, Chatswood Oval, Gore Hill Oval. The ridgetop parks tend to have better access for cars and public transport, shops and services. However, they tend to be isolated green spaces; and they lack the natural freshwater systems and harbour access. The gully parks tend to connect natural systems: creeks, bushland and harbour. Furthermore, the rising forested landform around the gully parks create a highly distinctive visual environment of canopy forest.

Tunks Park – A Vision:

A place of natural beauty: forest and wildlife setting.

A rare place on Middle Harbour where people can come into contact with the harbour.

A highly flexible place with a great variety of uses and users.

A strong and distinctive link in Sydney’s Green Grid and Blue Grid.

A visual environment where almost every surface is plants (trees & grass).

A place in Sydney where night is dark.

A place that is “everybody’s backyard”.

Celebrate this special place where saltwater and freshwater meet!

These are merely thoughts to start a process to develop a vision: one which will support, reinforce and protect this jewel into the future.

Implementing the Plan

Bay Precinct requests representation on the committee chosen to implement the plan.

Bay Precinct and Save Tunks Park **Strongly Agree** with the following statements from the draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park:

- ...’Council resolved not to consider sportsfield lighting at Tunks Park’ (Section 1.9, pg. 15). BP & STP comment that floodlighting the Park must never be contemplated (throughout the Plan, the importance of Tunks Park as the essential habitat for fauna is highlighted).
- Key findings for each dot point (Section 1.9, pg. 16):
 - o There was a high level of satisfaction with the park the way it is.
 - o The nature of the environment was a key focus for future maintenance and development.
 - o Many community members contest the amount of space and noise allowance that is given to boat and trailer users.
 - o Many community members commented on the need for traffic and parking solutions to manage high volumes of traffic, narrow road access and limited parking spaces.
 - o Residents living close to the park and direct neighbours frequently mentioned not wanting any high trees or visual barriers blocking views of the water
- The bushland of Tunks Park forms part of contiguous bushland and wildlife corridor. (section 2.2.1, pg. 21)
- Remnants of shell middens, rock art, caves and overhangs dating back 6,000 years are also known to exist in the Tunks Park area. (section 2.2.1, pg. 21)

- The part of Tunks Park located immediately west of the suspension bridge contained soils with a range of contaminants ... (section 2.4.2, pg. 32).
 - This loss of nutrients, combined with low nutrient status of parent material, produces a soil with low fertility. (section 2.4.2, pg. 32) BP & STP comment: *'Emphasis must be placed on the management of this sensitive gully to the west of the suspension bridge'*.
 - The park and Flat Rock Creek gully was identified as the most important reserve for birds in North Sydney. (section 2.4.4, pg. 35)
 - Trees and resident view management. Through the PoM consultation process a number of local residents raised concerns with potential impact on views from their properties of recent tree plantings by Council near the foreshore. These trees were planted by Council as part of ongoing programmes to improve tree canopy and related shade and habitat through its parks. This creates a challenging management dilemma for Council as the objectives for this tree planting are fundamental and important ones that Council is obliged to pursue. (section 2.5, pg. 39)
 - A range of Council studies highlight that one of the most important functions of North Sydney's foreshore parks and reserves is as public viewing points for enjoyment of the harbor environment. (section 2.5, pg. 39) BP & STP comment: *'Existing plantings need to be reviewed. Future plantings should be selected with care, particularly relating to height of growth'*.
 - Pedestrian access into the park is focused on Brothers Avenue at the Long Bay water frontage. ... At a local level the network of residential streets generally have narrow footpath walkways and the steep valley gradients to surrounding streets discourages walking for those less mobile and fit pedestrians. (section 2.7.1), pg. 52)
 - Cycle access. This network of residential streets generally have steep gradients which likely discourages some recreational cyclists. This is exacerbated by the narrow road width when streets are fully parked out and with high traffic volumes at times such as the Saturday morning peak cycling is less safe and comfortable at these times. (section 2.7.2, pg. 54)
 - Vehicular Access. Pinch points arise when on street parking on both kerbsides limits two way movement. This creates "friction" between vehicles in peak times as they travel into and out of the park and along The Boulevard and Cliff Avenue.
 - Parking. With overlap between game finishing time and the next game beginning, parking demand will increase during peak times. (section 2.7.3, pg. 55)
 - Changes to use and scheduling on Winter Saturday game days. It has been estimated that this arrangement resulted in 44 less players per hour for the peak period. (section 2.8.1, pg. 61). BP & STP notes that: *'The staggering of start times of games has had a noticeable and favourable effect on Saturday morning traffic levels in Winter'*.
 - Enhancement of wildlife corridors/linkages. Figure 10. (section 3.2.1, pg. 65)
 - Shade and tree canopy through maintained grass areas. Some degree of tree canopy continuity through the park would connect these bushland slopes visually and afford a degree of aerial habitat connection.
- Strategies
1. Existing opportunities within the park to enhance understorey plantings for improved habitat:
 - Replace small strips of grass between path and bush
 - Underplant ground covers in small swatches under existing trees
 2. Tree canopy links within the park:
 - Investigate potential for tree canopy links across the park that provide some degree of aerial linkage without unduly impacting the ground below.
 3. Enhanced shade tree canopy to park edges:
 - Investigate potential for additional shade through the park where possible – adjoining edges and existing trees.
 4. Foreshore tree planting:
 - Review recent foreshore tree planting as part of foreshore open space enhancements new plantings to take into account views within the park to the harbor.
 5. Nature and character of planting:
 - All new plantings in Tunks Park should be appropriate and sympathetic to the desired landscape character of each section of the Park, whether it is bushland or the more structured planting associated with the playing fields and Park buildings. (section 3.4.1, pg. 69)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Travel Plan</u>. The sustainable travel plan is a holistic approach to access that seeks to bring about a mode shift away from single occupancy car use for journeys to and from a location and increase the use of alternatives such as walking, cycling, public transport and car sharing. - <u>Strategies</u> - Development of a Transport Access Guide - Provision of a shuttle bus - Conversion of boat trailer parking into bus parking. - Improvement of pedestrian footpath - Additional pedestrian access points (section 3.6.1, pg. 74) - <u>Pedestrian and Cycle Access, Strategies – Pedestrian Access, Proposed Path Links/ Upgrades Recommended by this PoM</u> (BP & STP strongly agree with Pedestrian Access) (section 3.6.2, pg. 78-80) - <u>Cricket Nets</u> 'The PoM process has been unable to determine an acceptable location due to the following issues: Resident concern about noise, Provision of run-in, Distance from parking, Impact of fencing on circulation'. (Section 3.5.2, pg. 71) <p>Bay Precinct and Save Tunks Park Agree with the following statements from the draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tunks Park contains 2 items of Local Heritage Significance ... the overhead sewerage Aqueduct and century old suspension bridge. (section 2.2.4, pg. 22) - Interpretation of Aboriginal and European cultural heritage ... is limited. There is great potential to enhance park experience by improving interpretation. (section 2.2.4, pg. 23) - Flood events coupled with sea levels rise, storm surge, and high tides can impact the park leading to field, recreation, and parking inaccessibility as well as oval use restrictions due to field condition. (section 2.4.1, pg. 31) - Figure 9. Biodiversity "hotspots" (section 2.4.4, pg. 37) - <u>Sportsfields Target Usage</u>. A generally agreed sustainable target for sports turf usage for Local Government open space is an average maximum 25 hours of formal field usage per week. ... NSC's general sports usage cap for formal bookings is operated at a maximum target of average 32 hours per week. (section 2.8.1, pg. 58) - <u>Wayfinding</u>. There is limited wayfinding signage within the park. (section 2.8.6, pg. 62) - <u>Heritage Management</u>. From an Aboriginal heritage perspective any proposed alterations and or additions to tracks would need to take into consideration the potential of increased access to sensitive sites, and liaison and approvals through the Aboriginal Heritage Office. (section 3.3.1, pg. 68) <p>Bay Precinct and Save Tunks Park Strongly Disagree with the following statements from the draft PoM/Masterplan for Tunks Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Cycle Access</u>. An on road link down Brothers Avenue to Tunks Park is not currently identified either in the cycle plan or on site through road marking and signage. (section 2.7.2, pg. 54). BP & STP comment: <i>'The safety of cyclists would be at grave risk given that Brothers Avenue is so narrow'</i>. - <u>Pedestrian and Cycle Access, Strategies – Pedestrian Access, Proposed Path Links/ Upgrades Recommended by this PoM</u>. Existing path link from The Boulevarde. Continuous footpath to The Boulevarde/Rowlison Parade BP & STP note: <i>'There is no continuity of the footpath along the perimeter of the property at 49 The Boulevarde'</i>. Upgrade linking access through Judith Ambler Reserve from Currawang Street Provide gravel track margin to north edge of the park. - <u>Strategies – Cycle Access</u> - The opportunity to improve cycle access to the park by extending the on road cycle route from Rowlison Parade down Currawang Street and Brothers Avenue was identified. (section 3.6.2, pg. 78-80). BP & STP note: <i>'Refer also to our response to Section 2.7.2, concerning the treat to the safety of cyclists. As for Currawang Street and Brothers Avenue, The Boulevarde and Rowlison Parade are too narrow for safe cycling'</i>. <p>Bay Precinct and Save Tunks Park also note (re Sportsfield Use and Scheduling) that: <i>'Reductions in bookings are not considered feasible at this stage ... Council will continue to monitor opportunities to fine tune scheduling to reduce peak demands for parking and traffic'</i>. (Section 3.5.1(a), pg. 71).</p>
192	Note that several submissions have been excluded from this Table due to either their lack of relevance (several related to the creation of a Sydney Marine Park) or because their content was wholly abusive.