



# **BUSINESS PAPER**

## **GENERAL MEETING**

**Wednesday 14 July 2021  
at 6:30PM**



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### AGENDA AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### RESCISSION MOTIONS

### MAYORAL MINUTES

### ITEMS PASSED BY EXCEPTION / CALL FOR SPEAKERS ON AGENDA ITEMS

### GENERAL BUSINESS

#### Office of the General Manager

- Item 1 GM31/21 Discussion Paper - Brooklyn Place Planning - Feedback from  
Exhibition ..... 1
- Item 2 GM30/21 Draft Community Engagement Policy and Plan ..... 10

#### Corporate Support Division

- Item 3 CS40/21 Investments and Borrowings for 2020/2021 - Status for Period  
Ending 31 May 2021 ..... 18
- Item 4 CS44/21 Proposed Drainage Easement Over Road Reserve Austral Avenue  
and Kenwick Lane Beecroft ..... 21

#### Community and Environment Division

- Item 5 CE15/21 Draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan ..... 25

#### Planning and Compliance Division

Nil

#### Infrastructure and Major Projects Division

- Item 6 IM9/21 Westleigh Park Master Plan - Results of Public Exhibition ..... 34
- Item 7 IM7/21 Hornsby Shire Public Domain Guidelines ..... 47
- Item 8 IM10/21 Hornsby Park Master Plan - Results of the Public Exhibition ..... 52

### CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

- Item 9 GM33/21 Renewable Energy Proposal
- Item 10 CE13/21 Byle's Creek Walking Track Strategy

### PUBLIC FORUM – NON AGENDA ITEMS

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### MAYOR'S NOTES

Item 11 MN6/21 Mayor's Notes from 01 June - 30 June 2021 ..... 70

**NOTICES OF MOTION**

Item 12 NOM4/21 Berowra Pool..... 71

Item 13 NOM5/21 Investment in Non-Carbon Investments ..... 73

Item 14 NOM6/21 Train and Public Transport Services North of Hornsby..... 74

Item 15 NOM7/21 Rural Land Study Formal Transition of Responsibilities to the  
Newly Elected Council..... 76

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

**MATTERS OF URGENCY**

## **AGENDA AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **PRESENT**

### **NATIONAL ANTHEM**

### **OPENING PRAYER/S**

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY**

Statement by the Chairperson:

*"We recognise our Shire's rich cultural and religious diversity and we acknowledge and pay respect to the beliefs of all members of our community, regardless of creed or faith."*

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

Statement by the Chairperson:

*"Council recognises the Traditional Owners of the lands of Hornsby Shire, the Darug and Guringai peoples, and pays respect to their Ancestors and Elders past and present and to their Heritage. We acknowledge and uphold their intrinsic connections and continuing relationships to Country."*

### **VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDING OF COUNCIL MEETING**

Statement by the Chairperson:

*"I advise all present that tonight's meeting is being video streamed live via Council's website and also audio recorded for the purposes of providing a record of public comment at the meeting, supporting the democratic process, broadening knowledge and participation in community affairs, and demonstrating Council's commitment to openness and accountability. The audio and video recordings of the non-confidential parts of the meeting will be made available on Council's website once the Minutes have been finalised. All speakers are requested to ensure their comments are relevant to the issue at hand and to refrain from making personal comments or criticisms. No other persons are permitted to record the Meeting, unless specifically authorised by Council to do so."*

### **APOLOGIES / LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

### **POLITICAL DONATIONS DISCLOSURE**

Statement by the Chairperson:

*"In accordance with Section 10.4 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, any person or organisation who has made a relevant planning application or a submission in respect of a relevant planning application which is on tonight's agenda, and who has made a reportable political donation or gift to a Councillor or employee of the Council, must make a Political Donations Disclosure Statement."*

---

*If a Councillor or employee has received a reportable political donation or gift from a person or organisation who has made a relevant planning application or a submission in respect of a relevant planning application which is on tonight's agenda, they must declare a non-pecuniary conflict of interests to the meeting, disclose the nature of the interest and manage the conflict of interests in accordance with Council's Code of Conduct."*

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

*Clause 4.16 and 4.17 of Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors requires that a councillor or a member of a Council committee who has a pecuniary interest in a matter which is before the Council or committee and who is present at a meeting of the Council or committee at which the matter is being considered must disclose the nature of the interest to the meeting as soon as practicable. The disclosure is also to be submitted in writing (on the form titled "Declaration of Interest").*

- 4.16 *A councillor who has a pecuniary interest in any matter with which the council is concerned, and who is present at a meeting of the council or committee at which the matter is being considered, must disclose the nature of the interest to the meeting as soon as practicable.*
- 4.17 *The councillor must not be present at, or in sight of, the meeting of the council or committee:*
- a) *at any time during which the matter is being considered or discussed by the council or committee, or*
  - b) *at any time during which the council or committee is voting on any question in relation to the matter.*

*Clause 5.10 and 5.11 of Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors requires that a councillor or a member of a Council committee who has a non pecuniary interest in a matter which is before the Council or committee and who is present at a meeting of the Council or committee at which the matter is being considered must disclose the nature of the interest to the meeting as soon as practicable. The disclosure is also to be submitted in writing (on the form titled "Declaration of Interest").*

- 5.10 *Significant non-pecuniary conflict of interests must be managed in one of two ways:*
- a) *by not participating in consideration of, or decision making in relation to, the matter in which you have the significant non-pecuniary conflict of interest and the matter being allocated to another person for consideration or determination, or*
  - b) *if the significant non-pecuniary conflict of interest arises in relation to a matter under consideration at a council or committee meeting, by managing the conflict of interest as if you had a pecuniary interest in the matter by complying with clauses 4.16 and 4.17.*
- 5.11 *If you determine that you have a non-pecuniary conflict of interest in a matter that is not significant and does not require further action, when disclosing the interest you must also explain in writing why you consider that the non-pecuniary conflict of interest is not significant and does not require further action in the circumstances.*

## **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

THAT the Minutes of the General Meeting held on 9 June, 2021 be confirmed; a copy having been distributed to all Councillors.

## **PETITIONS**

## **PRESENTATIONS**

## **RESCISSION MOTIONS**

## **MAYORAL MINUTES**

## **ITEMS PASSED BY EXCEPTION / CALL FOR SPEAKERS ON AGENDA ITEMS**

### Note:

*Persons wishing to address Council on matters which are on the Agenda are permitted to speak, prior to the item being discussed, and their names will be recorded in the Minutes in respect of that particular item.*

*Persons wishing to address Council on **non agenda matters**, are permitted to speak after all items on the agenda in respect of which there is a speaker from the public have been finalised by Council. Their names will be recorded in the Minutes under the heading "Public Forum for Non Agenda Items".*

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

- *Items for which there is a Public Forum Speaker*
- *Public Forum for non agenda items*
- *Balance of General Business items*

## **OFFICE OF THE GENERAL MANAGER**

### **Page Number 1**

**Item 1 GM31/21 DISCUSSION PAPER - BROOKLYN PLACE PLANNING - FEEDBACK FROM EXHIBITION**

## **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT:

1. Council note the survey results and summary of comments received during the exhibition of the Discussion Paper - Brooklyn Place Planning outlined in the contents of General Manager's Report No. GM31/21.
2. Council endorse the guiding principles and priority actions for the development of the Brooklyn Place Plan as outlined in the contents of General Manager's Report No. GM31/21.

3. Council endorse the revised “working version” of the vision for Brooklyn outlined in the contents of General Manager’s Report No. GM31/21 – such that it may be further tested with stakeholders as the Brooklyn place planning process progresses.
4. A workshop be conducted with Councillors to discuss an approach to, and principles associated with, car parking management in Brooklyn.

**Page Number 10****Item 2 GM30/21 DRAFT COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT POLICY AND PLAN****RECOMMENDATION**

THAT Council:

1. Note the responses provided in Table 1 – draft Community and Engagement Policy and Plan – response to submissions to the public submissions received during the exhibition of the draft Community Engagement Policy and the draft Community Engagement Plan.
2. Adopt the draft Community Engagement Policy attached to General Manager’s Report No. GM30/21.
3. Adopt the draft Community Engagement Plan attached to General Manager’s Report No. GM30/21.
4. Write to all submitters notifying them of the Council’s decision and thanking them for their comments and suggested amendments.

**CORPORATE SUPPORT DIVISION****Page Number 18****Item 3 CS40/21 INVESTMENTS AND BORROWINGS FOR 2020/2021 - STATUS FOR PERIOD ENDING 31 MAY 2021****RECOMMENDATION**

That the contents of Director’s Report No. CS40/21 be received and noted.

**Page Number 21****Item 4 CS44/21 PROPOSED DRAINAGE EASEMENT OVER ROAD RESERVE AUSTRAL AVENUE AND KENWICK LANE BEECROFT****RECOMMENDATION**

THAT:

1. Council agree to the creation of a drainage easement over road reserve at Austral Avenue and Kenwick Lane subject to the payment of compensation and reimbursement of all costs as outlined in Confidential Attachment to Director's Report No. CS44/21.
2. The General Manager be authorised to execute documents in relation to creation of the drainage easement as deemed appropriate by Council's legal advisors.
3. Council authorise the use of its Seal on the Transfer Granting Easement, or any legal or other documents related to the creation of the Easement and Restriction on Use within the Road Reserve at Austral Avenue and Kenwick Lane Beecroft, as deemed appropriate by Council's legal advisors.

## **COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT DIVISION**

**Page Number 25**

### **Item 5 CE15/21 DRAFT COMMUNITY AND CULTURAL FACILITIES STRATEGIC PLAN**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT Council adopt the draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan shown as Attachment 2 to Director's Report No. CE15/21.

## **PLANNING AND COMPLIANCE DIVISION**

Nil

## **INFRASTRUCTURE AND MAJOR PROJECTS DIVISION**

**Page Number 34**

### **Item 6 IM9/21 WESTLEIGH PARK MASTER PLAN - RESULTS OF PUBLIC EXHIBITION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT COUNCIL:

1. Note the contents of Deputy General Managers Report No. IM9/21.
2. Defer the further consideration of the Westleigh Park Master Plan and note that council officers will continue to engagement with stakeholder groups to identify solutions to the matters raised in Deputy General Managers Report No. IM9/21.
3. Request a report on the results of the consultation with interest groups to be reported to Council by December 2021.
4. Progress investigations and approvals for the decontamination of the site.
5. Continue negotiations with Sydney Water on a suitable road alignment through its Thornleigh Reservoir site.



6. Notify submitters and the various stakeholders involved in the public exhibition of Council's decision to defer the adoption of the Westleigh Master Plan.

**Page Number 47****Item 7 IM7/21 HORNSBY SHIRE PUBLIC DOMAIN GUIDELINES****RECOMMENDATION**

THAT Council:

1. Adopt the Public Domain Guidelines attached to Deputy General Managers Report No. IM7/21 as the policy position of Council.
2. Note the preparation of a Standard Technical Manual which is included in the 2021/22 Delivery Plan to control the minimum construction standards and aesthetic outcomes of future public domain works undertaken by Council and private developers.
3. Endorse the preparation of associated amendments to the key diagrams in the Hornsby Development Control Plan be prepared to provide consistency with the Public Domain Guideline works for Asquith, Beecroft, Waitara, Thornleigh and West Pennant Hills.

**Page Number 52****Item 8 IM10/21 HORNSBY PARK MASTER PLAN - RESULTS OF THE PUBLIC EXHIBITION****RECOMMENDATION**

THAT Council:

1. Note the contents of Deputy General Managers Report No. IM10/21.
2. Adopt the Hornsby Park Master Plan, subject to the changes outlined in Deputy General Managers Report No. IM10/21.
3. Notify submitters and the various stakeholders involved in the public exhibition of Council's decision.

**CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS****Item 9 GM33/21 RENEWABLE ENERGY PROPOSAL**

*This report should be dealt with in confidential session, under Section 10A (2) (g) of the Local Government Act, 1993. This report contains advice concerning litigation, or advice that would otherwise be privileged from production in legal proceedings on the ground of legal professional privilege*

**Item 10 CE13/21 BYLE'S CREEK WALKING TRACK STRATEGY**

*This report should be dealt with in confidential session, under Section 10A (2) (c) of the Local Government Act, 1993. This report contains information that would, if disclosed, confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the council is conducting (or proposes to conduct) business. (This report contains confidential valuation information relating to potential easements and/or property acquisitions.)*

## **PUBLIC FORUM – NON AGENDA ITEMS**

### **QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

#### **MAYOR'S NOTES**

**Page Number 70**

**Item 11 MN6/21 MAYOR'S NOTES FROM 01 JUNE - 30 JUNE 2021**

### **NOTICES OF MOTION**

**Page Number 71**

**Item 12 NOM4/21 BEROWRA POOL**

COUNCILLOR MARR TO MOVE:

THAT:

1. Following the September 2021 election, the new Council convene a workshop to consider whether the Berowra Pool should be included on a future project list to attract funding and fulfil ratepayer and community needs.
2. The workshop should include a review of past feasibility studies, reports and analyses by community groups, consultants and Council staff.

**Page Number 73**

**Item 13 NOM5/21 INVESTMENT IN NON-CARBON INVESTMENTS**

COUNCILLOR MARR TO MOVE

THAT Council, in developing its next Long-Term Financial Plan, and subject to legislative investment requirements of the NSW State Government for local government, include an assessment of how to transition its investment strategy over time to one directed at complete investment in non-carbon producing investments.

**Page Number 74**

**Item 14 NOM6/21 TRAIN AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES NORTH OF HORNSBY**

**COUNCILLOR MARR TO MOVE****THAT:**

1. Council lobby for improvements to train and public transport services north of Hornsby, especially between Berowra, Cowan and Hawkesbury River Stations on weekdays and weekends.
2. The General Manager write to each of the local State and Federal Members of Parliament; the Minister for Transport; and the Secretary of Transport seeking support for, and commitment to, additional services being provided.
3. Council acknowledge that many Newcastle and Central Coast trains pass through these Stations.

**Page Number 76****Item 15 NOM7/21 RURAL LAND STUDY FORMAL TRANSITION OF RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE NEWLY ELECTED COUNCIL****COUNCILLOR DEL GALLEGO TO MOVE**

THAT Council inform the new Council to be elected in September 2021 that the current Council:

1. Has not scrutinised the Rural Land Study, submissions received, environmental impact or any other relevant matters, including associated costs to ratepayers in pursuing further investigations.
2. Notes, and must notify ratepayers, that any investigations to progress recommendations for changes to planning controls by Hornsby Council may be at significant costs to Hornsby Shire ratepayers. Proponents/Landowners led rezoning investigations are at no cost to Local or State Governments.

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA****MATTERS OF URGENCY**

## **1 DISCUSSION PAPER - BROOKLYN PLACE PLANNING - FEEDBACK FROM EXHIBITION**

---

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- The Discussion Paper – Brooklyn Place Planning, was developed as a first step to re-engage with the community of Brooklyn and the river settlements following the cessation of the Brooklyn Improvement Master Plan in late 2018.
- The Discussion Paper sought to test a draft vision for Brooklyn with the community, along with several guiding principles and priority actions.
- There was good to very good community agreement with the proposed guiding principles and priority actions. It is proposed that Council endorse these items and use them as key reference points moving forward with place planning for Brooklyn.
- Where agreement with individual guiding principles dropped below 70%, the absence of an articulated position on resolving car parking seemed to be the issue holding back further agreement. Taking on board community feedback, it is recommended that Council address car parking in Brooklyn in the first instance before proceeding with the place planning process.
- Whilst most people agreed with the draft vision for Brooklyn, a revised “working version” of the vision for Brooklyn has been developed based on community feedback.
- To progress the Brooklyn Place Plan, it is recommended that Council work with the community to produce a “consultant’s brief” for the next stage of works – including how engagement should be managed.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT:

1. Council note the survey results and summary of comments received during the exhibition of the Discussion Paper - Brooklyn Place Planning outlined in the contents of General Manager’s Report No. GM31/21.
2. Council endorse the guiding principles and priority actions for the development of the Brooklyn Place Plan as outlined in the contents of General Manager’s Report No. GM31/21.
3. Council endorse the revised “working version” of the vision for Brooklyn outlined in the contents of General Manager’s Report No. GM31/21 – such that it may be further tested with stakeholders as the Brooklyn place planning process progresses.
4. A workshop be conducted with Councillors to discuss an approach to, and principles associated with, car parking management in Brooklyn.

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this Report is to provide details of survey results received on the Discussion Paper – Brooklyn Place Planning (attached) and to gain agreement on key foundational principles as the Brooklyn place planning process progresses. The report also considers how the place planning process should best proceed based on community feedback.

## BACKGROUND

At the October 2018 General Meeting, Council considered Group Manager's Report No. PL28/18. This report noted that:

*Brooklyn Improvement Masterplan - There are a number of tasks that have not been completed to finalise the draft Brooklyn Improvement Masterplan. It is recommended that priority be given to working with the community on a place-making approach in the short term, with a focus on achievable short-term improvements prior to formally revisiting the Masterplan...*

A place-making approach allows Council to broaden single discipline thinking to focus holistically on people and places. In taking a place-making approach, Council aims to build stronger relationships with the community and be thoughtful and collaborative in our planning and strategy development.

## DISCUSSION

The Discussion Paper – Brooklyn Place Planning was drafted to re-engage with the Brooklyn and river communities following the cessation of the Brooklyn Improvement Masterplan in 2018. The document seeks to summarise the planning work previously undertaken in the precinct and reframes the work within a place making/place planning context – rather than a land use planning based context such as that employed through the Brooklyn Improvement Masterplan.

Importantly, the Discussion Paper recognises that without a clear vision or purpose it is difficult to make decisions about the future of Brooklyn and how it is planned and managed in a consistent and coherent fashion. The Discussion Paper also seeks to establish guiding principles that will help to make decisions about Brooklyn. These guiding principles are more specific in their focus but together, contribute to the overall vision for Brooklyn. Lastly, the Discussion Paper sought feedback on suggested high priority actions that set up a process pathway for resolving issues and formulating a place plan for Brooklyn using joined-up thinking.

### Survey results

Council letter box dropped survey promotional material to all residences in Brooklyn, Dangar Island and Milsons Passage. Email correspondence was also forwarded to all civic organisations in the Lower Hawkesbury area - regardless of whether their location is based within the Hornsby Shire - and invited stakeholders and residents to complete the survey. This approach was taken in recognition of the function that Brooklyn plays as an intermodal transport interchange for the broader river communities in the Lower Hawkesbury area. A total of 234 surveys were completed both online and in paper-based form. Feedback was received from the following parties:

Respondent group	Number of responses
Resident of Brooklyn	97
Resident of Dangar Island or Milsons Passage	91
Resident of elsewhere in the	12

Hornsby Shire	
Resident of Little Wobby, Mooney Mooney, Cheero Point, Cogra Bay or Bar Point	25
Own or operate a business in Brooklyn	15
Work in Brooklyn	21
Visitor or tourist to Brooklyn	11
Other	19

It is noted that a resident of Brooklyn may also nominate as working in Brooklyn (for example). This practically means that, the total number of “respondents” exceeds 234 in the table above – even though each survey has only been counted once in the guiding principles agreement percentages listed below.

The above figures constitute a 13% response rate from all Brooklyn residents and a 28% response rate of all residents of Dangar Island and Milsons Passage.

#### **Agreement with Guiding Principles**

Survey respondents were asked if they agreed with a guiding principle and if they did not agree they were required to explain why to progress through the survey. This approach was taken because understanding why a respondent disagreed with a principle was considered to facilitate a greater understanding of the issues involved. The following table outlines the collective level of agreement with each principle (in descending order of agreement) regardless of the residential location of the respondent.

<b>Guiding principle</b>	<b>Percentage agreement</b>	<b>Summary of comments from respondents disagreeing</b>
A town centre that celebrates and preserves its connection to the river, the environment and its heritage.	92%	Those disagreeing tended to prefer more of a focus on Aboriginal heritage. Some commented that car parking was a more pressing issue. Others commented that the word “celebrates” was not appropriate.
A town centre that is well maintained, attractive and with community custodianship.	88%	Those disagreeing tended to question the inclusion of community custodianship as part of the guiding principle.
A town centre that supports local business.	85%	Those disagreeing tended to comment that local businesses predominately serve visitors and that they didn’t benefit locals. Comments also suggested that suitable parking needs to be

		available to support businesses.
A town centre that is walkable, integrated, connected and active.	80%	Those disagreeing tended to do so if a walkable town centre meant that they would need to walk further to their vehicles.
A town centre that incorporates an appropriate community facility as a hub.	79%	Those disagreeing tended to seek clarification on what this would entail or how it would function as a hub.
A town centre that functions as a transport interchange.	71%	Those disagreeing tended to object to the notion that the Brooklyn village centre should provide this function – often mentioning car parking as a point of contention.
A town centre that maximises benefits from visitors for locals.	69%	Those disagreeing tended to comment that locals do not currently benefit from visitors and indicated that visitors tended to utilise limited car parking resources.
A town centre that is a vibrant and welcoming visitor destination with an active spine along Dangar Road.	69%	Those disagreeing tended to question the need for a vibrant town centre (as opposed to a sleepy village atmosphere), the desire to attract visitors who would further compete for parking, and the notion that Dangar Road may be developed to become “active” – attracting more visitors.

ITEM 1

The above percentage agreement results are considered to represent good to very good agreement with the guiding principles – with agreement generally above 70%. The guiding principles were derived from community feedback received from the Brooklyn Improvement Masterplan process and best practice standards and so high levels of agreement are not unexpected.

Of interest is the narrative that has developed in the comments provided when a respondent disagreed with a principle. When considered within a broader context, these comments would suggest that the areas of tension in Brooklyn very clearly relate to car parking and visitation to Brooklyn. Visitation to Brooklyn seems to be a point of tension because of the demand for car parking that this generates. It is also noted that there is competition for parking in the Brooklyn village centre from river residents – although this issue was not specifically articulated in the survey results.

#### **Agreement with the vision**

Despite the draft vision being an amalgam of most of the guiding principles, which had good to very good levels of agreement, overall agreement with the draft vision was relatively low at 56%. The draft vision, as exhibited, was:

*“The Brooklyn town centre protects its unique natural environment and celebrates its rich heritage and waterfront village atmosphere.*

*It functions well as a transport interchange between river, road and rail, while supporting local business and maximising the benefits of its visitor economy for the local population.*

*The Brooklyn town centre has a vibrant spine linking McKell Park and Bridge Street along Dangar Road.”*

Agreement with the vision differed depending on the location of the respondent. Approximately two thirds of Brooklyn residents agreed with the vision but less than half of Dangar Island/Milsons Passage residents agreed with the vision. Given the degree of agreement with the guiding principles, which informed the vision, an evaluation of the comments provided by those disagreeing with the vision has been undertaken. A respondent who “disagreed” with the vision tended to fall into one of three categories:

1. Misunderstanding of what a vision is – respondents tended to comment that they disagreed that the vision matched the current reality in Brooklyn.
2. There was not enough weight within the vision given to resolving car parking.
3. There were conditional agreements which register as disagreements e.g. I'd agree if only...e.g. a particular word was changed.

The above categories are not listed in any particular order.

There seemed to also be a view expressed that the vision should be more practical, and solution focused – rather than providing a goal to work towards and a tool to guide future decision making. There was also an undercurrent of mistrust of Council and cynicism expressed by those respondents disagreeing with the vision that the place planning process would produce any practical change on the ground. There were also many constructive and positive suggestions received when respondents disagreed that can be used to improve the vision.

To respond to the feedback received, a revised vision has been crafted based on the areas where there were very high levels of community agreement with the guiding principles. Constructive and positive suggestions have also been taken on board in this regard. The revised “working version” of the Brooklyn vision is:

*Brooklyn protects its unique natural environment and celebrates its rich European and Aboriginal heritage and waterfront village atmosphere.*

*The Brooklyn village is a liveable place for people that is welcoming and vibrant for the whole community – both residents and visitors.*

*The village centre is attractive, well maintained and provides support for local businesses.*

*In fulfilling its function as a port and transport interchange, Brooklyn village will support all river communities to transition between river, road and rail.*

In drafting this revised vision, the following elements and feedback have been taken into account:

1. A good amount of feedback on the importance of Aboriginal heritage was provided. Both European and Aboriginal heritage have now been referenced in the vision rather than a generic reference to heritage.
2. Brooklyn is a place for people – this element has been emphasised more explicitly in the revised vision.



3. Brooklyn is for residents and visitors – this element has been emphasised due to the recognition that Brooklyn serves as a destination for the whole of the Shire. Car parking studies undertaken in late 2019 indicate that 66% of cars entering Brooklyn on a mid-week vehicle survey day were owned by Hornsby Shire residents – 40% were from the newly developed suburbs with 2077 and 2079 postcodes. These postcodes include the suburbs of Hornsby, Hornsby Heights, Waitara and Asquith (2077) and Mount Colah (2079). This equates to roughly, 600 cars per day from within these two post codes alone. It is noted that the inclusion of this element is, perhaps, contrary to some of the community feedback – but an essential inclusion never the less as it speaks to an essential function that Brooklyn has.
4. An emphasis on Brooklyn as a transport interchange supporting all river communities has been included in the revised vision. Whilst there was concern raised over Brooklyn fulfilling this function, it is unfortunately not a matter for debate and is unavoidable. In including this element, it is noted that Council has adopted a Car Parking Management Study for the Shire, which will provide the policy position for future engagement with the community about car parking.

Given that this revised vision has not been tested with the community, it is proposed that it be treated as a “working version” of the vision as the place planning process progresses. At an opportune time, this vision would again be formally tested with the community through an exhibition period.

#### **Actions to proceed with**

In testing a path forward for the Brooklyn place planning process, 64% of survey respondents agreed with the high priority actions listed in the Discussion Paper.

Those actions were:

1. A clear place vision for Brooklyn – this outcome would provide a standard by which future decisions about Brooklyn could be measured against.
2. A functionally laid-out village centre (Brooklyn urban design footprint) – this work would produce, visually, a place plan layout for Brooklyn.
3. An economically sustainable and resilient village centre – the background informing work to produce this outcome would allow us to understand the economy of Brooklyn, determine tipping points regarding visitation (and also the benefits), and guide decision making around issues like car parking and how these decisions may support businesses that rely on the visitor economy.
4. Dangar Road activation strategy - this work would consider how to best use the Council owned assets on Dangar Road to deliver on the place principles and vision for Brooklyn.
5. A resolved approach to village centre parking – this work would consider the vision for Brooklyn and the functions that it needs to perform for residents, river residents, as well as visitors, and manage parking accordingly.

When respondents did not agree with the priority actions listed, they tended to disagree with the order in which the priority actions were listed (wanting a resolution of car parking prioritised) or they did not see a need to re-consider the layout of Brooklyn. It is noted that the action list was not listed in order of priority in the Discussion Paper as all elements need to be considered simultaneously. Consideration of the layout of Brooklyn was listed as an action because it is assumed that the current use of land is not necessarily the best use of land and that changes may need to be made to achieve the best outcome for Brooklyn.

## **Tourism and visitation**

In considering feedback received from the community through the survey, it is apparent that visitors and visitation to Brooklyn are points of conflict. Visitors compete for limited parking resources and often don't contribute to the local economy when they only utilise the Parsley Bay boat ramp or bring a picnic from home to eat in McKell Park – for example. Other visitors will attend Brooklyn for the cafes and restaurants – but parking is often constrained, and these offerings tend to be time limited to the middle of the day. Car parking in Brooklyn is not currently managed in a manner that supports a visitor economy as the majority of car parking spaces are untimed and the car parking survey indicates that spaces tend not to turn over with any degree of regularity - which makes parking for visitors difficult.

Importantly, car parking studies have also shown that Brooklyn serves a definite function as a regional recreational destination for residents of the Hornsby Shire who predominately live in higher density suburbs around Waitara and Asquith. This is especially the case in the mid-week period as previously mentioned. On weekends, this make up of visitors changes slightly to 61% of visitors being from the Shire - due to the broader attraction of the Parsley Bay boat ramp for recreational boating. Regardless, Brooklyn remains an important recreational destination for Hornsby Shire residents on weekends.

The newly adopted Economic Development and Tourism Strategy requires Council to develop a Destination Management Plan for river and rural areas in the Shire. This action builds upon a direction set by the Greater Sydney Commission via the North District Plan to improve and manage access to the Hawkesbury River.

It is clear that Brooklyn needs to play a role as part of the broader Hornsby Shire as a destination for day visitors in particular. It also has a role to play in hosting visitors from further afield who wish to tour the Hawkesbury River and surrounds. It is clear that this is a point of conflict for some people that live in Brooklyn, or who travel through Brooklyn to reach their homes in the Lower Hawkesbury. It would seem from feedback received through the Discussion Paper survey that taking steps to resolve car parking in the first instance, would remove any uncertainties about the competition for parking from visitors for local residents.

To progress this matter, an early workshop should be conducted with the new Council, due to be elected in September 2021, on the adopted Car Parking Management Study recommendations for Brooklyn. The workshop would discuss an approach to, and principles associated with, car parking management in Brooklyn.

## **Future engagement**

Moving forward with the Brooklyn place planning process, it is important that Council continues to collaborate with the community and be responsive to feedback.

As a way forward to progress the Brooklyn Place Plan it is recommended that community stakeholders continue to collaborate with Council and work to produce a 'Consultant's Brief' for engagement and planning work to be undertaken to produce the place plan. This informal group, comprised of Council staff and external stakeholders, would be tasked, amongst other things, with articulating/identifying key input components of the planning process, including those relating to engagement. In simple terms, this group would be tasked with creating a brief of exactly what needs to be done rather than be tasked with solving the problems – noting that a broad process pathway has already been identified and tested with the community via the Discussion Paper survey.

Importantly, in considering how to best engage with the community moving forward on the Brooklyn Place Plan, the consultant's brief will need to articulate the context, scope (negotiable and non-

negotiable elements) and the purpose of any future engagement processes as the place planning process progresses.

## **CONSULTATION**

The consultation undertaken to produce this report has been described in the body of the report. 234 people from Brooklyn, the river communities and elsewhere in the Shire completed an online and paper-based survey which responds to the Discussion Paper – Brooklyn Place Planning document.

In discussing the results of the survey with the executive committees of the Dangar Island League and the Brooklyn Community Association, it was made clear to Council officers that addressing car parking in the first instance is the preferred pathway forward.

## **BUDGET**

There are no budgetary implications associated with this Report. The Brooklyn Place Plan is funded in the adopted Delivery Program including Operational Plan 2021/22.

## **POLICY**

There are no policy implications associated with this Report. The development of the Brooklyn Place Plan will be aligned with adopted strategies, studies and plans.

## **CONCLUSION**

Place planning for Brooklyn needs to be an iterative process that responds to community feedback as it arises and adapts processes to suit. In this instance, significant community agreement was found on the guiding principles for Brooklyn and the priority actions required to progress the place plan. It is recommended that Council endorse the guiding principles and priority actions for the Brooklyn Place Plan and that it also endorses the revised “working version” of the vision for Brooklyn listed within this report – such that it may be further tested with stakeholders as the place planning process progresses.

It is recommended that a “Draft Consultant’s Brief” is developed for progressing the Brooklyn Place Plan (with input from community stakeholders) which would consider all of the negotiable and non-negotiable elements for change in Brooklyn, such that when consultants respond to the brief, they may accurately determine the most appropriate community engagement methodology to produce the Brooklyn Place Plan.

However, prior to progressing the place planning process, the community feedback has been such that a focus should, in the first instance, be placed on resolving an approach to car parking in Brooklyn. To this end, it is recommended that a workshop be conducted with Councillors to discuss an approach to, and principles associated with, car parking management in Brooklyn.


## **RESPONSIBLE OFFICER**

The officer responsible for the preparation of this Report is the Strategic Place Manager – David Johnston - who can be contacted on 9847 6800.

LOUISE GEE  
Manager - Strategy and Place  
Office of the General Manager

STEVEN HEAD  
General Manager  
Office of the General Manager

**Attachments:**

1.  Discussion Paper - Brooklyn Place Planning

File Reference: F2019/00117

Document Number: D08190336

**ITEM 1**

## **2 DRAFT COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT POLICY AND PLAN**

---

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- At its meeting on 14 April 2021, Council resolved to place the draft Community Engagement Policy and the draft Community Engagement Plan on public exhibition.
- The draft Policy outlines Council's commitment to building open, transparent and active relationships with the community, and the draft Plan supports the draft Policy and provides a guide for staff and consultants in the deliverance of best-practice community and stakeholder engagement with high-quality outcomes.
- The draft Policy and Plan were placed on public exhibition from 16 April 2021 to 28 May 2021, with a total of four submissions received. Feedback from all submissions has been reviewed and considered in the final drafts of both documents. These changes have been shown in comparison support files posted on Council's website: [hornsby.nsw.gov.au/yoursay](https://hornsby.nsw.gov.au/yoursay) (under the Policy and Plan tab).
- The majority of the feedback received was regarding the application of Council's community engagement processes and thoughts on what needed to be improved. For this reason, most amendments made to the documents relate to clarifying wording to be more explanatory.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT Council:

1. Note the responses provided in Table 1 – draft Community and Engagement Policy and Plan – response to submissions to the public submissions received during the exhibition of the draft Community Engagement Policy and the draft Community Engagement Plan.
2. Adopt the draft Community Engagement Policy attached to General Manager's Report No. GM30/21.
3. Adopt the draft Community Engagement Plan attached to General Manager's Report No. GM30/21.
4. Write to all submitters notifying them of the Council's decision and thanking them for their comments and suggested amendments.

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this Report is to provide Council with information and recommendations regarding the submissions received during the public exhibition of the draft Community Engagement Policy and the draft Community Engagement Plan and to seek Council's endorsement of the final documents.

## BACKGROUND

In June 2019, Council engaged an external consultant to develop a Communications and Engagement Strategy, and supporting policies, to guide all communication and engagement activities.

In February 2020, the Communications and Engagement Strategy and four associated draft policies were completed.

At the 8 July 2020 General Meeting, two draft policies were adopted by Council – the Media Policy and Social Media Policy for Councillors.

The draft Community Engagement Policy and the draft Community Engagement Plan were presented to an informal workshop in March 2021. At its meeting on 14 April 2021, Council considered General Manager's Report No. GM17/21 and resolved that:

1. Council endorse the exhibition of the draft Community Engagement Policy attached to General Manager's Report No. GM17/21.
2. Council endorse the exhibition of the draft Community Engagement Plan attached to General Manager's Report No. GM17/21.
3. A further report be brought to Council following the conclusion of the exhibition and submission period.

## DISCUSSION

### Submissions

Four submissions were received during the formal exhibition period. The main themes and feedback from the submissions are summarised below. Council's responses to individual issues/items raised is detailed in Table 1 – draft Community and Engagement Policy and Plan – response to submissions.

Themes	No. of submissions	Summary of Feedback
<b>Support for the Policy and Plan</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Engagement Framework and the Cycle proposed - Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate, Empower – with an emphasis on Inform and Collaborate, is most commendable.</li> <li>• We welcome an engagement plan that further improves the aspects of information, consultation, involvement, collaboration and empowerment of residents to make better decisions.</li> </ul>
<b>Purpose of the draft Community Engagement Plan</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A need for Council to clarify the purpose of the draft Plan and what is meant by the term 'engagement'.</li> </ul>
<b>Engaging with Council</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to provide feedback/discuss submissions directly with a Council Officer(s).</li> <li>• Understand how the community can better engage</li> </ul>

Themes	No. of submissions	Summary of Feedback
		<p>with Councillors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal opportunities / process for stakeholder advocacy.</li> <li>• Council does not respond to questions in a timely manner.</li> <li>• Council does not provide the opportunity for all residents that wish to, to be able to speak at Council meetings.</li> <li>• Feedback at Council meetings is not discussed or responded to.</li> </ul>
<b>Consultation process</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of meaningful engagement with local Traditional Owners and the local Aboriginal community in the Hornsby LGA.</li> <li>• Request for Council to provide clear and reasonable timelines for projects and communicate changes.</li> <li>• Request for Council to provide the purpose of a document on exhibition and where it sits in the consultation pipeline.</li> <li>• Council does not properly design and implement engagement.</li> <li>• Council does not provide enough opportunities for stakeholders to get involved.</li> <li>• Council doesn't effectively target specific stakeholders.</li> <li>• Council doesn't encourage stakeholders to discuss, decide and debate matters to create better outcomes for the community.</li> </ul>
<b>Council communications of public exhibitions</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requesting Council to proactively contact community groups who have registered to be informed / when documents and plans become available for engagement.</li> <li>• Utilise rates notices for engagement communications.</li> <li>• Council does not keep residents informed about projects and planning matters.</li> <li>• Council captures inaccurate information.</li> </ul>
<b>Council's response to submissions process</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note all submission comments are raised in Council reports or considered when amending documents or plans.</li> <li>• Identifying staff changes versus those made in response to submissions.</li> <li>• Council fails to provide an adequate summary of</li> </ul>

ITEM 2

Themes	No. of submissions	Summary of Feedback
		community engagement outcomes.
<b>Mandatory minimum exhibition periods and scheduling of exhibitions</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 days is too low.</li> <li>• Council should provide the longest exhibition period possible for strategies, plans and policies.</li> <li>• Council exhibits multiple major plans at the same time.</li> </ul>
<b>Engagement and notifications on development and planning matters</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council does not reach the people that are representative of those affected by decisions.</li> <li>• Improvement is needed to ensure community engagement is acknowledged and addressed throughout the decision-making process.</li> <li>• Extent of notifications and exhibitions of Development Applications (DAs) – signage, written notifications including letters to residents and community groups.</li> <li>• Lack of notification of Local Planning Panel hearings.</li> <li>• Council doesn't notify the public about developments which are not expected to impact the surrounding properties and areas.</li> <li>• Council's 'track a development application' page isn't kept up to date.</li> <li>• Clarification is required regarding the definition of 'threatened species development'.</li> </ul>
<b>Exhibition of DAs and planning proposals</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum exhibition periods for DAs should be extended when there is significant community interest or the information in accompanying documents or maps is inaccurate.</li> <li>• If a DA is amended due to issues raised in public submissions, it should be re-exhibited.</li> <li>• Council fails to provide clear, consistent advice to residents with regard to consideration of late submissions.</li> <li>• Council should provide flexibility in the timeframe for considering submissions.</li> <li>• Stipulate in the draft plan that exhibition timing of Voluntary Planning Agreements is concurrent with any DA or planning proposal.</li> </ul>
<b>DA documentation</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council fails to adequately review DAs and associated documentation before accepting the applications.</li> <li>• DA documentation is exhibited with incorrect information.</li> </ul>



Themes	No. of submissions	Summary of Feedback
<b>Privacy and protection of personal information</b>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legislative obligations are not met when making submissions publicly available.</li> <li>Permission should be sought before publishing any submission.</li> </ul>

#### Outcomes from submissions

As a result of feedback from the community during the exhibition period, the following changes have been made to the two draft documents.

#### Draft Community Engagement Policy

One change has been made to the draft Community Engagement Policy, to change the name of the Related Policy/Plan to “Community Engagement Plan” for consistency across documentation.

#### Draft Community Engagement Plan

The following amendments have been made to the draft Community Engagement Plan.

Page	Amendment
Document footer	Amended from ‘Community Participation Plan’ to <b>‘Community Engagement Plan’</b> .
Page 7	<p>Include the following wording (in bold) to clarify the purpose of the draft Plan:</p> <p>This community engagement plan is your guide to how you can help to plan our future <b>by providing feedback on items placed on exhibition for formal public consultation.</b></p>
Page 8	<p>Include the following wording (in bold) to list the core principles:</p> <p><b>These principles align with the seven core principles in Council's Community Engagement Policy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Community engagement is strategy-led</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Community engagement is proactive</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Community engagement is open and inclusive</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Community engagement is easy</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Community engagement is relevant</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Community engagement is timely</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Community engagement is meaningful</b></li> </ul>
Pages 14-15	In the draft Plan, the column 3 heading in the

	table updated from ' <b>How</b> ' to ' <b>Possible tactics</b> '.
Page 16	<p>Include the following wording (in bold):</p> <p><b>Each item on exhibition will have a nominated project contact. Questions can also be directed to Council's Customer Service Team via the following channels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>In-person at the Customer Service Centre at 296 Peats Ferry Road, Hornsby NSW 2077</b></li> <li>- <b>Via telephone to 9847 6666</b></li> <li>- <b>Via email to HSC@hornsby.nsw.gov.au</b></li> </ul>
Page 17	<p>Delete the first sentence:</p> <p>We encourage community feedback, which can be provided at any time, via your preferred method of communication.</p>
Page 21	<p>Include additional wording in the heading (in bold):</p> <p>Notification and exhibition of development applications and other <b>development</b> matters.</p>
Page 27	<p>Include following explanatory note for Voluntary Planning Agreement:</p> <p><b>In accordance with Clause 25D(1) of the EP&amp;A Reg, where practicable, notification of the VPA will occur as part of and contemporaneously with, any notice of the development application that is required; and if it is not practicable for notice to be given contemporaneously, as soon as possible after any notice of the development application that is required to be given.</b></p>

#### Further considerations for Council

These are Council's first formal Community Engagement Policy and Plan. These documents form part of the current strategic review of our community consultation process and lay the foundation for us to become a more 'engaging' organisation.

As outlined in the Operational Plan (Section 4i page 113), key initiatives in this direction include:

- Investigating innovative digital tools and methodologies to improve the ways we engage with our community (including providing information, project updates, reporting of outcomes). This will include the ability to sign up to receive regular updates on projects open for comment.
- Scope the development of a customer relationship management system to enable better consultation/communication with residents on the projects that interest them.

In addition to these initiatives, we are building internal capability through additional staff training and improving our internal processes by standardising procedures, engagement planning and reporting templates.

### **CONSULTATION**

During the exhibition period from 16 April 2021 to 28 May 2021, the draft Community Engagement Policy and the draft Community Engagement Plan were available electronically on the Have Your Say page of Council's website.

In addition, notice of the exhibition was provided through the following channels:

- Print advertisements in four local publications – the Bush Telegraph, the Hornsby Ku-ring-gai Post, Galston & Glenorie News and the Dooral Roundup
- Inclusion in the May eNewsletter – sent to 30,000 subscribers
- Posting on Facebook
- Triple H radio interview with the General Manager

### **BUDGET**

There are no budgetary implications associated with this Report. Scoping of a digital tool as referenced above will be conducted with existing budget allocations.

### **POLICY**

The draft Community Engagement Policy acts as a guide for Council staff and representatives who engage in public consultation with the Hornsby Shire community. It articulates the standards and principles that underpin all engagement practice within Council and outlines the high-level process by which engagement is planned and implemented.

### **CONCLUSION**

The draft Community Engagement Policy and draft Community Engagement Plan act as a guide for Council staff and representatives who communicate and engage with our community on behalf of Council. They serve as the foundation for building on Council's current practices to continuously improve how we engage with our community and involve them in decisions that affect them.

### **RESPONSIBLE OFFICER**




The officer responsible for the preparation of this Report is the Communications and Engagement Manager – Tracy Bass – who can be contacted on 9847 6790.

LOUISE GEE  
Manager - Strategy and Place  
Office of the General Manager

STEVEN HEAD  
General Manager  
Office of the General Manager

**ITEM 2**

**Attachments:**

1.  Table 1 - Community Engagement Policy and Plan - response to submissions
2.  HSC\_draft Community Engagement Policy\_final
3.  HSC5963 Community Engagement Plan FINAL DRAFT

File Reference: F2018/00308

Document Number: D08182219

**3 INVESTMENTS AND BORROWINGS FOR 2020/2021 - STATUS FOR PERIOD ENDING 31 MAY 2021**

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- This Report provides details of Council's investment performance for the period ending 31 May 2021 as well as the extent of its borrowings at the end of the same period.
- Council invests funds that are not, for the time being, required for any other purpose. The investments must be made in accordance with relevant legislative requirements and Council's policies and the Chief Financial Officer must report monthly to Council on the details of funds invested.
- All of Council's investments have been made in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act, the Local Government (General) Regulation and Council's Investment of Surplus Funds Policy and Investment Strategy.
- In respect of Council's cash and term deposit investments, the portfolio achieved an annualised return for May 1.58% which includes a yield of 7.95% from TCorp Managed Funds.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the contents of Director's Report No. CS40/21 be received and noted.

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this Report is to advise Council of funds invested in accordance with Section 625 of the Local Government Act; to provide details as required by Clause 212(1) of the Local Government (General) Regulation and Council's Investment of Surplus Funds Policy; and to advise on the extent of Council's current borrowings.

**BACKGROUND**

Legislation requires that a report be submitted for Council's consideration each month detailing Council's investments and borrowings and highlighting the monthly and year to date performance of the investments. Initial investments and reallocation of funds are made, where appropriate, after consultation with Council's financial investment adviser and fund managers.

**DISCUSSION**

Council invests funds which are not, for the time being, required for any other purpose. Such investment must be in accordance with relevant legislative requirements and Council Policies, and the Chief Financial Officer must report monthly to Council on the details of the funds invested.

Council's investment performance for the month ending 31 May 2021 is detailed in the attached document. In summary, the portfolio achieved an annualised return for May of 1.58% and year to date 1.83%.

In respect of Council borrowings, the weighted average interest rate payable on outstanding loans taken out from June 2011 to June 2013 (the last time that Council borrowed), based on the principal balances outstanding, is 5.99%. The Borrowings Schedule as at 31 May 2021 is also attached for Council's information.

**BUDGET**

Budgeted investment income for the year is \$5,239,939 with an average budgeted monthly income of \$436,662. Net investment income for the month ended 31 May 2021 was \$403,911 which includes an unrealised gain of \$143,597 from TCorp Managed Funds.

Budgeted investment income year to date at 31 May 2021 is \$4,803,283. Total investment income year to date at 31 May 2021 is \$4,783,783 which includes a year to date net gain of \$1,493,622 from TCorp Managed Funds.

Approximately 58.37% of the investment income received by Council relates to externally restricted funds (e.g. Stronger Communities Grant funding and Section 7.11 and Section 7.12 development contribution funds) and is required to be allocated to those funds. All investments have been made in accordance with the Local Government Act, the Local Government (General) Regulation and Council's Investment of Surplus Funds Policy and Investment Strategy.

The returns from TCorp Managed Funds are presently experiencing significant market volatility due to uncertainty over the COVID-19 Pandemic on economic conditions. It is noted that this product has a 7-year investment horizon and will therefore reflect marked to market valuations monthly. Advice provided by Council's independent investment advisor, Prudential Investment Services, is to hold this investment for the 7-year timeframe originally planned. This is due to the anticipated net positive performance returns that will be gained over the long term for this investment.

**CONCLUSION**

The investment of Council funds and the extent of its borrowings as at 31 May 2021 is detailed in the documents attached to this Report. Council's consideration of the Report and its attachments

ensures that the relevant legislative requirements and Council protocols have been met in respect of those investments and borrowings.



**RESPONSIBLE OFFICER**

The officer responsible for the preparation of this Report is the Chief Financial Officer – Duncan Chell - who can be contacted on 9847 6822.

DUNCAN CHELL  
Chief Financial Officer  
Corporate Support Division

GLEN MAGUS  
Director - Corporate Support  
Corporate Support Division

**Attachments:**

1.  HSC Investments Summary Report May 2021
2.  HSC Borrowings Schedule May 2021

File Reference: F2004/06987-02  
Document Number: D08182789

**4 PROPOSED DRAINAGE EASEMENT OVER ROAD RESERVE AUSTRAL AVENUE AND KENWICK LANE BEECROFT**

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- A “Deferred Commencement” Development Consent has been issued for the Torrens title subdivision of one allotment into two lots at 39 Austral Avenue, Beecroft.
- The consent requires creation of a drainage easement over road reserve in Austral Avenue to Kenwick Lane.
- The property owner has agreed to pay the compensation determined by Council’s valuer and to reimburse all costs incurred by Council in creation of the drainage easement.
- Creation of the easement is recommended subject to the terms and conditions in this report.

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT:

1. Council agree to the creation of a drainage easement over road reserve at Austral Avenue and Kenwick Lane subject to the payment of compensation and reimbursement of all costs as outlined in Confidential Attachment to Director’s Report No. CS44/21.
2. The General Manager be authorised to execute documents in relation to creation of the drainage easement as deemed appropriate by Council’s legal advisors.
3. Council authorise the use of its Seal on the Transfer Granting Easement, or any legal or other documents related to the creation of the Easement and Restriction on Use within the Road Reserve at Austral Avenue and Kenwick Lane Beecroft, as deemed appropriate by Council’s legal advisors.



## PURPOSE

The purpose of this Report is to obtain Council's approval to the granting of a drainage easement over road reserve at Austral Avenue and Kenwick Lane, Beecroft in favour of 39 Austral Avenue, Beecroft subject to the terms and conditions outlined in the Report.

## BACKGROUND

On 3 April 2017, a Deferred Commencement approval (DA/812/2016) requiring creation of a drainage easement was granted. The deferral states:

### Deferred Commencement

Pursuant to Section 80(3) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, this consent does not operate until the following information is submitted to Council:

- a) The registration and creation of a 1m wide easement to drain water from the site at Lot B, DP 348759, No 39 Austral Avenue, Beecroft over the road reserve in Austral Avenue to Kenwick Lane.

Such information must be submitted within 36 months of the date of this notice.

On 3 February 2020, the applicant sought an extension of the time period to satisfy condition No.1 for an additional 12 months which was approved by Council on 11 February 2020. The consent would lapse on 3 April 2021.

In response to Covid-19 impacts on the development industry, the NSW Government introduced amendments to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, to extend the period of consents during the period commencing on 25 March 2020 and ending on 25 March 2022.

Pursuant to Section 4.53 (6)(c) the deferred consent will lapse 2 years after 3 April 2021 being 3 April 2023.

## DISCUSSION

The applicant initially sought Council's approval for the drainage easement. During the investigation of the easement it was determined that the unformed section of the road subject of the proposed drainage easement was a Crown Road. The applicant was advised that Council does not acquire an easement over Crown Land for the benefit of a private landowner. The applicant was referred to the Crown as Council had no authority to create an easement on Crown land not in Council control.

The applicant sought approval for an easement from the Crown but was advised that the Crown did not provide private easements for drainage purposes. The Crown required any easements over Crown land to be owned by an authority (either Council or Water provider).

Following the applicant's request to the Crown and the Crown's investigations, the Crown contacted Council regarding transferring the land to Council. Council advised the Crown in July 2020 that it objected to the transfer of the portion of unformed road. The Crown contacted Council in March 2021 advising of their intent to transfer the unformed portion of Austral Avenue to Council pursuant to s.1521 of the *Roads Act 1993*. The transfer of the Crown land to Council occurred on 19 March 2021 with publication in the government gazette.

On 31 May 2021, an application accompanied by Council's fee \$1,635, was lodged for creation of the easement now that land had been transferred to Council. Following an internal review and negotiations the following terms have been accepted by the applicant:

1. The easement will now be 1.2m in width and not the 1m as specified in the DA.

2. Compensation would be determined by Council's valuer and would be a non-negotiable amount.
3. Council will be reimbursed for its reasonable legal fees incurred in connection with the drafting, preparation and advice given to Council in relation to the granting of the easement and the entering into of appropriate documentation including any survey fees, work inspection fees, creation of plans and other relevant and associated disbursements.
4. It is acknowledged that the granting of the easement including the entering into of any documentation giving effect to the easement is subject to a formal resolution of Council.
5. Agreement to make good all damage and assume all liability including the provision of dated photographic evidence and a site inspection report before and after completion of the works.
6. Agreement to any design standards set by Council as may be required by Council's drainage engineers during and on completion of construction of the works.
7. Existing and subsequent owners to accept responsibility for the future maintenance and repair of all the works and all pipes and conduits etc forming part of those works.
8. Provision of safe and convenient public access through the road reserve and ongoing access for Council's maintenance purposes, which must be maintained throughout the duration of the work.

Council engaged an independent valuer to undertake an assessment of compensation payable for the granting of the easement. A copy of this confidential report is provided at Attachment 1.

Subject to approval to creation of the easement, Council's Solicitor will be instructed to prepare a "Deed of Agreement to Grant Easement" with an attached Section 88B Instrument and Positive Covenant to give effect to the agreed terms as outlined in this report.

#### **CONSULTATION**

In the preparation of this Report there was consultation with technical officers from the Parks, Development Assessment and Asset Management teams.

#### **BUDGET**

The net compensation will provide unbudgeted income for the 2021/2022 budget.

#### **POLICY**

There are no policy implications associated with this Report.

#### **CONCLUSION**

As the application to connect into existing stormwater pipes via an easement on the road reserve, as required by the development consent, will have minimal impact, it is considered reasonable. The negotiated and agreed net compensation provides adequate compensation for Council.

#### **RESPONSIBLE OFFICER**

The officer responsible for the preparation of this Report is the Property Asset Manager – Lynne Ferrier - who can be contacted on 9847-6678

LYNNE FERRIER  
Property Asset Manager - Land and Property  
Services  
Corporate Support Division

GLEN MAGUS  
Director - Corporate Support  
Corporate Support Division

**ITEM 4**

**Attachments:**

1. Valuation Report - *This attachment should be dealt with in confidential session, under Section 10A (2) (d) of the Local Government Act, 1993. This report contains commercial information of a confidential nature that would, if disclosed (i) prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied it; or (ii) confer a commercial advantage on a competitor of the council; or (iii) reveal a trade secret.*

File Reference: F2017/00248  
Document Number: D08194271

## 5 DRAFT COMMUNITY AND CULTURAL FACILITIES STRATEGIC PLAN

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan provides direction for the future planning, provision and management of Hornsby Shire Council's (Council) community and cultural facilities over the next 10 years. It is a revision of Council's previous *Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan 2015* and was placed on public exhibition from 19 November 2020 to 31 January 2021.
- A total of 78 submissions were received from the community during the public exhibition process, primarily focused on the recommendations for Brooklyn, Cherrybrook and Hornsby. Two, in-person informal workshops have been held in March and June 2021 with Councillors to work through these community submissions.
- Following analysis, amendments are recommended to the specific strategies identified for Brooklyn and Cherrybrook generally as follows:
  - Brooklyn – the amended recommendation promotes consolidation of existing facilities into a consolidated multi-purpose centre of 100-200sqm however no longer specifies that this should be the existing Meeting Room. Further, the analysis section for the north eastern district in the draft Strategy has also been updated to note the Lower Hawkesbury Aquatic and Recreation Association's (LHARA) proposal for a new facility in Parsley Bay and community support for such.
  - Cherrybrook – the amended recommendation maintains the need for a district level hub with a 1,000 sqm library and 300 sqm multipurpose community space, however no longer designates the preferred location as the Cherrybrook Station Precinct. This would enable Council to undertake further detailed feasibility analysis on various options (including around Greenway Park) before settling a preferred location.
- It is recommended that Council adopt the revised Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan attached to Director's Report No. CE15/21.

### RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council adopt the draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan shown as Attachment 2 to Director's Report No. CE15/21.

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this Report is to provide Council with a summary of the community feedback received in respect of the draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan and to seek the adoption of the revised plan.

## BACKGROUND

At the November 2020 General Meeting, Council considered Director's Report No. CE13/20 and resolved that:

1. *'Council adopt the draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan for the purposes of public exhibition.'*

The Plan was placed on exhibition from 19 November 2020 to 31 January 2021. During the exhibition period 78 submissions were received. Two in-person, informal Councillor workshops were held in March and June 2021 to work through these community submissions.

A copy of the submissions received can be found in Attachment 1.

This report considers the feedback received during the exhibition period and makes recommendations with respect to changes to the draft Strategy.

## DISCUSSION

Elton Consulting have prepared the draft Plan to provide Council with strategic direction in respect of the management and administration of Council's community and cultural facilities over the next 10 years. The draft Plan is focussed on the following questions:

- What principles and directions should guide planning for facilities?
- Where should facilities be located?
- What spaces and services should they include?
- What size should facilities be?
- How could management of facilities, including leases and licences, be improved?
- What is a sustainable approach to fees and charges?
- What strategies should Council prioritise?

A series of nine principles has been used to guide the planning and provision of community facilities in the Shire. These include:

- A coordinated network
- Centrally located within districts and regions
- Serving identified social and cultural needs
- Making best use of existing facilities
- Financially sustainable
- Multipurpose and flexible
- Friendly and welcoming
- Accessible

- Near public space

The draft Plan provides 8 high level, long term directions which form the foundation of the draft Plan's strategic intent. Those directions are:

<b>1</b>	Locate sub-regional facilities in Hornsby Town Centre, as part of the Hornsby Town Centre revitalisation.
<b>2</b>	Focus on developing multipurpose district hubs at Pennant Hills, Cherrybrook and Galston.
<b>3</b>	Do not create or provide land for new single purpose, standalone facilities.
<b>4</b>	In the first instance, specific use spaces, which are identified as adding value to the community based on new or emerging demand, should be co-located in existing district hubs. If district hub co-location is not possible, consider locating specific use spaces in other existing and compatible facilities. Providing additional floor space should not be considered.
<b>5</b>	Work with Scouts NSW and Girl Guides NSW to renew all leases for scout and guide halls, except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waitara Guide Hall</li> <li>• halls not maintained to a safe standard</li> <li>• halls without demonstrated activity and regular and systematic use.</li> </ul>
<b>6</b>	Where spaces in existing sporting facilities are suitable or where new sporting facilities are being planned (e.g. Waitara Oval), facilitate equitable community access and use through broader community hire and standardised fees.
<b>7</b>	Investigate alternative booking system technologies to enhance usability for customers and staff, including online functionality.
<b>8</b>	Continue to apply consistency and sustainability of fees and charges

## CONSULTATION

Following Council's consideration of the draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic in November 2020, Council publicly exhibited the draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan for a period of 42 days. The public exhibition was progressed via the following channels:

- Direct notification with:
  - Volunteer Management Committees.
  - Community Centre User Groups.
  - Tenants in leased facilities.
  - Scouts and Guides.
- Advertisement on Council's website – Have Your Say.
- Advertisement on Future Hornsby website.
- Council's eNewsletter
- Emails to Future Hornsby database (users who registered for updates on the Sustainability or "all topics" under the Accelerated LEP Review).

- Social Media (Facebook, LinkedIn and Localised).
- Advertising and Mayor's message - Bush Telegraph, Galston & Glenorie News, Dural Roundup, Hornsby Kuring-gai Post and Living Heritage.

Arising from the exhibition a total of 78 submissions were received. The submissions can be broken down to districts as follows.

- All Districts 2
- Central District 17
- North Eastern District 29
- North Western District 1
- Southern District 29

Key themes arising from the submissions are outlined below:

- Opposition to the proposed recommendations for Brooklyn, and would like a larger community facility committed to at Parsley Bay (28 submissions)
- The proposed location of a new Cherrybrook Community Centre and Library is not suitable and should be more centrally located near the shopping village/existing community centre (26 submissions)
- The timeframe identified in the s7.11 plan and reflected in the draft Strategy for a delivery of a new Hornsby Regional Library and Community Centre is too distant, with facilities required in the more immediate future (15 submissions)
- Support for the proposed strategy for Wallarobba Arts and Cultural Centre (2 submissions); would like to ensure that Wallarobba retains capacity to host affordable community scale exhibitions (1 submission)
- Concern around maintenance scheduling/resourcing of existing facilities in Pennant Hills and proposed fees/charges for any new facilities especially for non-profit organisations (2 submissions)
- Galston Library should be bigger and offer full library services (1 submission)

### **Summary of Strategic Direction Feedback**

The community did not raise concerns with the high level, long term directions listed earlier in this Report and it is recommended that Council adopt these directions as exhibited.

### **Specific District Recommendations**

The draft Plan also makes specific district-based recommendations. The majority of community feedback received through the consultation period was focussed on these district-based recommendations. This feedback is included in submissions which are included at Appendix 1.

Having considered the community feedback, it is recommended that a number of specific district-based recommendations are amended as follows:

Area	Original Recommendation	Revised Recommendation	Comment
<b>North Eastern (Brooklyn)</b>	A space of approximately <b>100-200sqm</b> is likely to be suitable for multiple community uses in Brooklyn. A suitable existing facility (up to 200sqm with hall/s and meeting room/s) should become a focus for consolidated uses. In the existing facilities, the most suitable would be Brooklyn Meeting Room (138sqm).	Consolidate existing facilities (Baden Powell Hall, Brooklyn Leisure & Learning, and 10 Dangar Road) into a consolidated multi-purpose community facility of <b>100-200sqm</b> for Brooklyn.	<p>Community feedback did not support the original recommendation for community facilities to be consolidated into the existing Meeting Room.</p> <p>Community submissions instead supported the Lower Hawkesbury Aquatic and Recreation Association's (LHARA) proposal for a new multi-purpose facility at Parsley Bay and that it should be included in the draft Strategy.</p> <p>Considering community feedback, a revised recommendation is proposed that is still focussed on consolidation of spaces in Brooklyn, however the Meeting Room is no longer specified as the preferred location for consolidated uses.</p> <p>The analysis section for the north eastern district of the draft Strategy has also been updated to note the LHARA proposal for a new facility in Parsley Bay and community support for such. Whilst this does not extend to specifically recommending the LHARA proposal in the key strategies for the North Eastern District, it also does not nominate</p>

**ITEM 5**



Area	Original Recommendation	Revised Recommendation	Comment
			<p>the Meeting Room allowing flexibility going forward.</p> <p>This approach would allow the community support for the LHARA proposal to be recognised in a Council strategic document and enable the community to continue to advocate for and seek external funding for the proposal.</p>
<p><b>South Eastern (Cherrybrook)</b></p>	<p>Deliver a district level hub, with a 1,000sqm library and 300sqm multipurpose community space, in a <b>new Cherrybrook SP hub</b>.</p> <p>Spaces in the hub should address current gaps in facilities in the Southern district, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study rooms</li> <li>• A flexible larger space for community gatherings, which can be converted into smaller spaces</li> <li>• Indoor-outdoor connections.</li> </ul> <p>No additional facilities should be committed to in the South Western sub-district until planning for the Cherrybrook SP is progressed/resolved</p>	<p>Deliver a district level hub, with a 1,000sqm library and 300sqm multipurpose community space, in a <b>new Cherrybrook hub</b>.</p> <p>Spaces in the hub should address current gaps in facilities in the Southern district, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study rooms</li> <li>• A flexible larger space for community gatherings, which can be converted into smaller spaces</li> <li>• Indoor-outdoor connections.</li> </ul>	<p>Community feedback received suggests that the proposed Cherrybrook SP location for a new Cherrybrook Library and community space would not be convenient to many residents, and that a more appropriate location associated with the Greenway Park/Cherrybrook Shopping Village precinct would better meet community needs.</p> <p>Considering community feedback, a revised recommendation that notes the need for new facilities in Cherrybrook however does not specify the Cherrybrook SP location is proposed.</p> <p>This would enable Council to undertake further detailed feasibility analysis on various locations before</p>

Area	Original Recommendation	Revised Recommendation	Comment
			finalising a preferred location.
<b>South Eastern (Cherrybrook)</b>	Consider how management and spaces in <b>Cherrybrook Community and Cultural Centre</b> can complement the spaces and services offered in the Cherrybrook SP hub, so the two facilities can contribute to network provision collaboratively.	Delete recommendation	No longer required having regard to the proposed changes identified above.
<b>South Eastern (Cherrybrook)</b>	<b>Timing for Strategy 6</b> In alignment with Cherrybrook SP delivery	<b>Timing for Strategy 6</b> Ongoing	Removes reference to Cherrybrook SP in line with changes to other Cherrybrook recommendations.

A substantial number of community submissions also focussed on the perceived delay in delivering the proposed new Hornsby Facilities and that these facilities are required in the immediate future. It is understood that these submissions related to page 23 of the draft Strategy that reflected funding priorities in Council's adopted s7.11 along with estimated timeframes. In this regard it is important to note that the s7.11 Plan was adopted in 2020 prior to this update of the Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan, and prior to the commencement of the Hornsby Town Centre project that is still in progress. It is most likely that the delivery of new Hornsby Facilities would align with any redevelopment of the Hornsby Town Centre following the conclusion of the Hornsby Town Centre project. The draft Strategy has been updated to remove reference to estimated s7.11 timeframes.

Changes made in response to the originally exhibited draft Strategy have been shown in a comparison support file posted on Council's website: <https://future.hornsby.nsw.gov.au/draft-community-cultural-facilities-strategic-plan/>

## BUDGET

Council's s7.11 development contributions plan identifies \$83.5M in capital expenditure across Council's community and cultural facility portfolio over the coming decade aligned to the 2015 Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan. Should Council adopt the draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan attached to Director's Report No. CE15/21, the s7.11 Plan would need to be updated such that its work schedule aligns with the Strategic Plan.

Council needs to consider the above with caution as the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces has recently tabled legislation in the NSW Parliament that outlines substantial changes to the collection of development contributions (both s7.11 and s7.12 contributions). The changes proposed are quite extensive and will have a substantial impact on both the amount of contributions that can be collected and what infrastructure can be provided via these contributions. This and other proposed changes

within the legislation will have material ramifications on Council's capacity to deliver, significantly needed infrastructure as a result of population growth and new development in the Shire. It should be noted that the State proposes, via this legislation to introduce new state charges on development.

Notwithstanding, it is noted that the draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan is a high-level, strategic document that outlines Council's approach to the future provision of community and cultural facilities. Implementation of specific recommendations contained within the draft Strategy would occur through the development of Council's Delivery Program, annual budget and Operational Plan and would be subject to the strategic priorities of Council, the availability and allocation of resources by Council.

Council has a strong track record of financial responsibility and a quadruple bottom line approach, including financial sustainability considerations, when making decisions and committing to new projects and programs is critical.

### **POLICY**

The draft Plan sets the high-level strategic direction for Council's ongoing provision of community facilities.

### **CONCLUSION**

The draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan details a strategy for Council's future provision of community facilities. The recommendations contained in the draft Plan have been the subject of extensive community consultation over a period of months and a number of changes have been made to detailed recommendations in the Plan for Brooklyn and Cherrybrook on the basis of this consultation.

The overall eight key strategic directions of the Plan remain unchanged.

If adopted, the draft Plan will inform future Delivery Programs and Operational Plans such that the goals of the draft Plan are achieved.



### **RESPONSIBLE OFFICER**

The officer responsible for the preparation of this Report is the Manager Community Facilities and Projects – Darren Crumpler, who can be contacted on 9847 6842.

CHERYL ETHERIDGE  
Manager - Library and Community Services  
Community and Environment Division

STEPHEN FEDOROW  
Director - Community and Environment  
Community and Environment Division

### **Attachments:**

1.  Submissions - draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan
2.  draft Community and Cultural Facilities Strategic Plan

File Reference: F2009/00391-03  
Document Number: D08183904

**ITEM 5**

## **6 WESTLEIGH PARK MASTER PLAN - RESULTS OF PUBLIC EXHIBITION**

---

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- The draft Master Plan was exhibited from 21 April to 16 June 2021 inclusive.
- A broad-based community survey identified that there was high level of community support for the draft Master Plan's Vision; the balance of 'active' and 'passive' recreation activities and the balance of restoring and protecting the natural environment whilst also providing a diverse range of recreation activities.
- Other engagement channels identified a high-level support for the provision of sports fields coming from sporting groups, members of sporting clubs, individuals who play sport or have family and friends that are avid sports people.
- These channels also noted that why there a high level of support for unstructured recreation opportunities, the extent and location of some of these activities was questioned, particularly:
  - The length and type or grade of mountain bike trails
  - The location of mountain bike trials (including the link between Hornsby and Westleigh Parks) in endangered ecological communities
- The use of Sefton Road to service the land use proposals contained in the Master Plan was questioned.
- The Westleigh Progress Association and the Westleigh Waterboard Alliance and some residents generally supported the use of Sefton Road but only as an access during an emergency. Residents within Sefton Road were, in general, concerned with the local road network becoming further congested and Sefton Road being a rat run for through traffic.
- There was support from most of the interest and stakeholder groups, plus shire wide residents for the inclusion of a children's playground, a café and other potential facilities such as club house and/or a community venue. There were also requests for inclusion of a cycling criterium course.
- A significant volume of feedback mentioned the ecological significance of the site and the need for its biodiversity to be protected.
- The matters raised above and the magnitude of responses on these matters warrant further consideration and it would be difficult to recommend an adoption of the Master Plan until further investigation and consideration of alternative solutions have been canvassed and discussed with the various stakeholder groups.
- Solutions to the above matters may have an impact on the proposed layout of all uses set out in the Westleigh Master Plan.

- It is recommended that Council:
  - Defer further consideration of the current Master Plan and that further consultation be undertaken to resolve/clarify the matters raised.
  - Progress investigations and approvals for the decontamination of the site to satisfy the grant obligations.
  - Progress negotiations with Sydney Water to secure an access through its Thornleigh Reservoir site.

**RECOMMENDATION**

## THAT COUNCIL:

1. Note the contents of Deputy General Managers Report No. IM9/21.
2. Defer the further consideration of the Westleigh Park Master Plan and note that council officers will continue to engagement with stakeholder groups to identify solutions to the matters raised in Deputy General Managers Report No. IM9/21.
3. Request a report on the results of the consultation with interest groups to be reported to Council by December 2021.
4. Progress investigations and approvals for the decontamination of the site.
5. Continue negotiations with Sydney Water on a suitable road alignment through its Thornleigh Reservoir site.
6. Notify submitters and the various stakeholders involved in the public exhibition of Council's decision to defer the adoption of the Westleigh Master Plan.

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this Report is to present the results of the public exhibition of the Draft Westleigh Park Master Plan; to outline issues and to foreshadow the next steps.

## INTRODUCTION

Westleigh Park is located at 62 Quarter Sessions Road, Westleigh on Lot 101 DP 1217395. The land, comprising 36 hectares is owned by Hornsby Council and is currently zoned (R2) Low Density Residential and Environmental Management (E3) in the Hornsby Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2013, with adjoining lands zoned as (R2) Low Density Residential or (RE1) Public Recreation.

The Westleigh Park land was formerly owned by Sydney Water and adjoins the Sydney Water Thornleigh Reservoir to the south and is bordered by bushland to the north. Quarter Sessions Road runs along the western frontage of the park with some adjoining residential properties backing on to the site from Koorringal Avenue to the east.

The site comprises both cleared open space (about 10 hectares) and bushland areas, including approximately 10km of unsanctioned mountain bike trails within the bushland areas of the site. The mountain bike trails have existed for many years and were originally built by the mountain biking community whilst the land was in Sydney Water's ownership.

The aim for Westleigh Park is to cater for sport activities and a choice of unstructured recreation experiences which range from mountain biking, walking and cycling and play spaces in addition to conserving important bushland areas.

Once the Master Plan is finalised and adopted by Council, detailed design of the individual elements within the Park will begin. Part 5 (Review of Environmental Factors) and/or Part 4 (development applications) approvals under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act will then be sought. Further community consultation will be an integral part of the approval process.

## BACKGROUND

At the April 2021 General Meeting Council considered Deputy General Managers Report IM2/21 and resolved to:

1. *Endorse the public exhibition of the Draft Master Plans for Hornsby and Westleigh Parks for a period of 42 days.*
2. *Acknowledge that a financially responsible approach requires that the projects be staged commensurate with available funding.*
3. *Acknowledge that the estimated cost of both projects and more importantly Council's ability to cover operational, maintenance and renewal costs means that there will be a need to focus on the delivery of one project.*
4. *Confirm that it wishes to focus on the delivery of Hornsby Park and for this to be expressed in the messaging associated with the public exhibition.*
5. *Require the results of the public exhibition to be reported to the July General Meeting of Council.*

This report deals with the results of the public exhibition for Westleigh Park. The outcome of the Hornsby Park public exhibition is the subject of Deputy General Managers Report No. IM9/21.

The Master Plan is a schematic document, framing the project proposal generally with further detailed design consideration and approvals needed. The location and design considerations of the various

elements that make up the Master Plan are generally indicative and subject to further consideration/approval factors such as site survey, social, environmental and heritage conditions.

The draft Master Plan sets out the types of suitable uses and activities that Hornsby Shire Council (Council) proposes to deliver within the park.

The exhibited draft Master Plan responds in large part to Council's Sportsground Strategy (2018), which identifies the need for additional sporting facilities to meet current and future needs within the local government area. Opportunities to provide passive recreation and other non-structured recreation activities were included in the draft Master Plan, along with a new road that links Quarter Sessions and Sefton Roads. The uses included in the publicly exhibited Master Plan for Westleigh Park included:

- Multi-use sporting fields (night lit and irrigated) for various organised sports including a synthetic grass sportsground, athletics track, amenities buildings, grandstands, and maintenance sheds.
- Bushland restoration – conservation and rehabilitation of the park's bushland to enhance ecological values - including removing or reducing the extent of mountain bike tracks in the existing environmentally sensitive bushland areas.
- Play facilities and provision for active and passive recreation, bushwalking trails, and potentially formalised mountain bike tracks.
- Pedestrian and cycle share ways with links to nearby Ruddock Park.
- Parking areas to service park and all recreation facilities, roads for access and circulation.

The draft Master Plan illustrating the arrangement of various uses is shown in Attachment 1. It is important to note that in-principle support to access the Westleigh Park site through Sydney Water's Thornleigh reservoir site has been obtained.

### **Proposed Link between Hornsby and Westleigh Parks**

The draft Westleigh Park Master Plan also included a proposed link between Westleigh and Hornsby Parks. It was anticipated that the link would be provided to coincide with the delivery of the first stage of Hornsby Park. This link would offer another experience to visitors of either park, with it able to be enjoyed by those moving through the Shire on foot or bike.

### **DISCUSSION**

The draft Master Plan was exhibited from 21 April to 16 June 2021 inclusive. The feedback from the public exhibition was coordinated by Elton Consulting and resulted in the preparation of **Westleigh Park Draft Master Plan Outcomes Report** (2021), which is included at Attachment 2.

In addition to Elton Consulting, Micromex Research & Consulting was commissioned to undertake a two-stage community survey utilising telephone recruitment followed by an online e-contact with Hornsby Shire residents. This research focused on resident:

- Views on the range of possible uses and activities in the Park
- Views on access options for the site
- Attitudes towards the Draft Master Plan
- Views on the balancing of macro-themes which informed the Plan.



The Micromex survey provided a broad-based deliberative and robust understanding of community sentiment towards the Hornsby Park project. The survey outcomes supplement the information obtained from Elton's work.

The survey was undertaken in two-stages, with 700 residents contacted by telephone followed by online recontact with 399 of these persons to seek more in-depth responses.

The purpose of the two-stage design was:

The Stage 1 phone survey provided initial responses that reflect the broad community interest in terms of:

- Frequency of outdoor recreation activities and whether more/same/less of each is required
- Familiarity of the Plan
- Likely future usage

The Stage 2 online survey included images/videos and links to plans to generate more considered responses regarding level of appeal of the proposed options, suggestions for additional features and likely future usage (which could be compared to Stage 1).

The following sections summarise the broad issues and conclusions arising from the work undertaken by Micromex and Elton Consulting.

### **Micromex Survey**

Hornsby Shire Council commissioned Micromex to undertake a two-stage community survey (initial telephone recruitment followed by an online e-contact with Hornsby Shire residents to better understand the community views on future outdoor recreation options. This research examines residents':

- Attitudes towards the Draft Master Plan for Hornsby Park
- Current and potential future usage of the Park
- Whether Council as managed to balance some macro-themes which informed the Plan.
- Appeal for a range of possible uses/activities
- Accessing the site.

The Micromex survey was undertaken in a two-stage mixed model design:

Stage 1: Telephone survey with N=700 residents (including 100 acquired through face-to-face number harvesting).

Stage 2: Online recontacts with 399 of the Stage 1 phone respondents.

The purpose of the two-stage design was:

The Stage 1 phone survey provided initial responses that reflect the broad community interest in terms of:

- Frequency of outdoor recreation activities and whether more/same/less of each is required in the Hornsby Shire.
- Familiarity of the Plan, and
- Likely future usage.

The Stage 2 online survey included images/videos and links to plans to generate more considered responses regarding level of appeal of the proposed options, suggestions for additional features and likely future usage (which could be compared to Stage 1).

### ***Micromex Survey Results***

A summary of the key results of the survey (Attachment 2) are set out below under the following headings:

- Familiarity with the Plan
- Visitation
- Most appealing aspects
- Least appealing aspects
- Appeal of specific features
- Suggestions
- Feelings towards the Master Plan
- Method of travel

#### ***Familiarity with the Master Plan***

Familiarity with the plans for the Westleigh Park site is low, with only 21% mentioning they are at least somewhat familiar with the plans. However, those living in Ward B (and specifically those in Westleigh –caution, only 20 unweighted), and residents that have lived in the area for more than 20 years are more likely to be familiar with the plans for this site.

#### ***Visitation***

Younger residents (aged 18-44) and those living in Ward B (and Westleigh –caution, small sample) are significantly more likely to have visited the Westleigh Park site in the past 12 months.

22% of residents have been to the Westleigh Park site in the past 12 months, with 7% mentioning they have been at least five times.

Younger residents (aged 18-44) and those living in Ward B (and Westleigh –caution, small sample) are significantly more likely to have visited the Westleigh Park site in the past 12 months.

Younger residents, non-ratepayers, those living in Ward B (notably Westleigh), newcomers to the area and those with children at home are significantly more likely to suggest they would visit the Westleigh Park site in the future.

Those that are at least somewhat familiar with the plans for the Westleigh Park site, those that have been to the site at least once in the last 12 months, and those that have used the existing bike trails, are significantly more likely than other residents to suggest they will visit Westleigh Park in future for recreation frequently.

#### ***Most appealing aspects***

Based on an open-ended question, the most appealing aspects of Westleigh Park are the sporting fields and facilities. Parks, bushland and green open space were also commonly mentioned.

***Least appealing aspects***

Concerns around transport infrastructure such as access and traffic congestion, and the fact there will be too much of a focus on sport are the least appealing aspects of Westleigh Park.

***Appeal of specific features***

50+% of residents committed to the top 'very appealing' code for 'walking tracks through the bushland that are specifically designed to minimise impact on threatened/endangered natural environment', 'protection and improvement of bushland areas', 'protection and ongoing management of threatened/endangered natural environment' and 'picnic/gas BBQ facilities'.

The least appealing potential feature of Westleigh Park is having a user-pays system for any purpose-built, high maintenance features, although 77% of residents still find this at least somewhat appealing.

Females, residents aged 18-44, and non-ratepayers are significantly more likely to find picnic and gas BBQ facilities at the Park appealing.

Males are significantly more likely to find having several turf surface and/or synthetic surface sports fields for community sports appealing.

Those living in Ward B, and residents that have lived in the area for over 20 years, are more likely to find access to the Park from Quarter Sessions Road in the west and Sefton Road in the south appealing.

Those living in Ward B and Westleigh (noting this is a small sample), and newcomers to the area, are more likely to find the idea of linking Westleigh Park to Ruddock Park to be an appealing feature.

Those that plan to visit Westleigh Park frequently are significantly more likely than other residents to find features such as walking tracks, picnic and BBQ facilities, access to the park from Quarter Sessions Road and Sefton Road, and bike tracks specifically designed to minimise impact on threatened/endangered natural environment to be more appealing.

Those that plan to visit Westleigh Park frequently are significantly more likely to find features such as linking Westleigh Park to Ruddock Park, athletics facilities, several turf surface sports fields and having a user pays system for purpose built, high maintenance features more appealing.

***Suggestions***

Common suggestions for additional features at Westleigh Park include having a variety of sport/active recreation facilities, more cafes/food options and water recreation areas.

***Feelings towards the draft Master Plan***

75% of residents believe that the Draft Master Plan for Westleigh Park has a good balance of 'active' and 'passive' recreation activities –although a sizeable minority (23%) feel too much priority is given to active recreation (which is consistent with the open-ended responses).

81% of residents believe the master plan has a good balance of restoring and protecting the natural environment whilst also providing a diverse range of recreation activities.

Those that have used the existing bike trails within Westleigh Park are significantly more likely to believe the draft Master Plan gives too much priority to 'passive' recreation activities.

Residents that plan to visit Westleigh Park at least once every two or three weeks and those that have visited the site at least once in the last 12 months are significantly more likely than other residents to believe the draft master plan gives too much priority to restoring and protecting the natural environment on site.

**Transportation**

90% of residents suggested that if they were to visit Westleigh Park, they would most likely arrive via a private car. One third of those that would travel via private car stated they would most likely enter the park from Quarter Sessions Road, and one third mentioned they would enter from Sefton Road. Those living in Ward B/Westleigh are significantly more likely to walk or cycle on footpaths to get to the site.

Those that have visited the Westleigh Park site at least once in the last 12 months, and those that have used the existing bike trails within Westleigh Park, are significantly more likely than other residents to suggest they would enter the Park from Quarter Sessions Road.

**Awareness of environmental value of the bushland**

Overall, 44% of residents are at least somewhat aware that the bushland on the Westleigh Park site is of high environmental value, containing endangered flora and fauna. Older residents, those living in Westleigh (caution, small sample) and those that do not have children living at home, are significantly more likely to be aware of this.

**Feelings towards the Master Plan**

75% of residents believe that there is a good balance of active and passive recreation activities

81% of residents believe there is a good balance of restoring and protecting the natural environment whilst also providing a diverse range of recreation activities

**Elton Thematic Feedback Approach**

Elton consulting undertook a qualitative thematic analysis which reports on themes identified during the consultation process the firm carried out. The results of this qualitative analysis are included in Attachment 3 and summarised below. The themes were derived from several data sources including:

- Swing-bys (785 people)
- On line surveys (1,878)
- Stakeholder groups (69 attendees over six meetings)
- Council Advisory Committees (HATSICC, BMAC, HAC and ESAC)
- Written submissions (293)

The following feedback was received.

**Support for Mountain Biking**

About 58% of tallied themes within written submissions raised mountain biking and most of these submissions (85%) did not agree with the proposed changes. These submissions were generally from the mountain biking community who both live within and outside of the shire. This strongly correlated to the feedback captured at the swing-bys where almost identical sentiments were heard.

Submissions and swing-by feedback that related to opposing the proposed changes to Mountain Biking tracks did so on the following basis:

- The site is unique and valuable through its provision of “green/ beginner” graded tracks that are ideal for learning

- There is a variety of tracks that offer a range of difficulty which assists riders to progress their abilities and hone their skills on the one site, and the reduction of trails as proposed would render them too short for enjoyment.
- Mountain biking provides benefits to overall health, wellbeing and mental health.
- It is a family sport, a sport for all ages and growing in popularity
- Mountain biking fosters an appreciation for the natural environment and contested the assertion that Mountain Biking has a detrimental impact on the Endangered Ecological Communities (EEC) or is not incompatible with an EEC.
- Willingness to volunteer time towards trail maintenance., and fear that the proposed changes would result in more unsanctioned tracks.
- There are already enough sports ground facilities in the Shire, and an under supply of Mountain Bike trails.
- The potential economic benefits of Mountain Biking to the wider community such as tourism, especially if facilities on site such as café and bike shop were to be included.

#### ***Support for a reduction of Mountain Bike Trails***

In contrast, 8% of submissions received supported the proposed changes. This was mostly on biodiversity and environmental grounds. Of note, was the obligation Council has pertaining to legislation and policies regarding the protection of Critically Endangered Ecological Communities. Some of these argued that mountain biking should be excluded from the endangered ecological communities.

#### ***Separation of Tracks and Trails***

Perhaps the only aspect in the Draft Master Plan mountain biking, bushwalking and environmental groups all agreed on was the need to separate biking and walking paths. Groups pointed to existing conflict at both Westleigh and Hornsby Park (Old Mans Valley) and the 'friction' any shared paths causes between the groups.

#### ***Road extension and new Intersection for Sefton and Quarter Sessions Roads***

Aside from mountain bike trails on the site, traffic impacts and **concerns** stemming from road changes were very prominent throughout the swing bys as well as the written submissions. Approximately 6 per cent of the responses raised some type of concern. The majority of these were concerned with the proposal's impact on traffic congestion and volume of traffic that would be generated. These concerns included:

- Safety concerns (the bend at Sanctuary Gardens, it's camber, the point where it narrows near the roundabout and the right of way not being clear).
- Parking (overflow on surrounding streets).
- Rat run - would only like the access road open during emergency, otherwise closed to through traffic to Quarter Sessions Road.

A smaller number of residents supported the proposed road extension and roundabout citing the need for a second exit.

The Westleigh Progress Association and the Westleigh Waterboard Alliance supported a connection to Sefton Road for access during an emergency only.

A majority (85%) of on-line surveys supported a proposal to extend Sefton Road to Quarter Sessions Road and indicated that they would use this connection (57%).

### ***Sports Platforms***

Many submissions that raised the matter of sporting fields (75%), mostly from sporting groups, members of sporting clubs, individuals who play sports or have family or friends that are avid sportspeople, supported the proposal for three sports platforms. The basis for this support was generally the lack of available sporting facilities within the shire. While many of these submissions specifically mentioned support for synthetic surfaces and lighting, others expressed concern about the environmental impacts of synthetic and the impact that lighting would have on neighbours and fauna.

In contrast a small number of submissions **questioned the need for multiple sports platforms on the site** and would have preferred some of the area to be instead used for passive recreation, other activities such as Mountain Biking or for a new RFS brigade building and other community facilities.

### ***Link between Westleigh and Hornsby Parks***

This issue was divisive – at swing bys the wider community were very supportive of the link, yet the submissions told a completely different story. This division is reflective in the online survey where 56% of participants said they would be very likely to use a cycling and walking track between Hornsby Park and Westleigh Park.

Those that were supportive of the link, were in the main from the mountain biking community. Those who were unsupportive were generally neighbours or had raised environmental considerations in their response.

### ***Community Facilities***

This theme is one of the few from all the feedback submitted which received significant support from a clear majority of interest and stakeholder groups, plus shire wide residents. The inclusion of a children's playground, a café and other potential facilities such as club house were recognised as being needed.

### ***Other matters***

A small number of submissions raised the possibility of including a criterium circuit in the development proposals for the site.

### **Summary of main issues/findings from Micromex and Elton**

In summary Elton identified from its online survey and the written submissions that the main issues were:

- Opposition to alternative mountain bike track network
- Management and restoration of the natural environment
- Sefton Road extension and management of traffic

The Micromex survey concluded that:

- 75% of residents believe that there is a good balance of active and passive recreation activities
- 81% of residents believe there is a good balance of restoring and protecting the natural environment whilst also providing a diverse range of recreation activities

**Matters arising from the public exhibition**

There are two approaches available to Council:

- a) Adopt the Master Plan has exhibited.
- b) Defer adoption of the Master Plan.

Adoption of the Master Plan would be on the basis there was majority support for the content of the document and that it provided a good balance of active and passive recreation activities and a good balance of restoring and protecting the natural environment whilst also providing a diverse range of recreation activities. The link to Sefton Road would acknowledge two accesses are required to support the proposals included in the draft Master Plan and to provide an alternate access in the event of an emergency. Other issues, including noise, lighting and traffic impacts would be addressed as part of later development approvals.

However, the matters raised above and the magnitude of responses on these matters warrant further consideration and it would be difficult to recommend an adoption of the Master Plan until further investigation and consideration of alternative solutions had been canvassed and discussed with the various interest groups. The solutions are likely to take some time to resolve and it may not be entirely possible to adequately address the concerns of all parties. Balancing the requirements for the provision of suitable mountain bike trails against Council's obligations and desire to protect endangered ecological communities will present challenges, but this report outlines a view that supports Mountain Biking as legitimate recreation use at the site that is to be encouraged and supported. The solutions may have an impact on other proposals included in the draft Master Plan. Several submissions from the Mountain Bike community have offered variations on Council's draft proposal that deserve detailed analysis.

Options to address the concerns of residents in Sefton Road are less challenging and could be addressed through the introduction of suitable traffic and event management strategies for the sporting activities and general access restrictions.

Should Council support the second option there is merit in pursuing the approvals for remediation of the site ahead of the resolution of the outstanding issues. This is worth considering given the demonstrated support for developing a sports precinct on the site due to the lack of available sporting facilities within the shire and Council's obligations under the grant conditions. Remediation of the site would be guided by a Remediation Action Plan that has been approved by an Independent Site Auditor (accredited by the NSW EPA) and will ensure that the site is suitable for its proposed open space use.

Irrespective of the option chosen Council would continue negotiations with Sydney Water to secure a suitable road alignment through its Thornleigh Reservoir site.

**CONSULTATION**

The engagement and consultation strategy sought views from a wide cross section of the community on the proposals contained in each draft master plan.

The Draft Master Plans were publicly exhibited concurrently for a period of 42 days ending 16 June 2021. Notification of the public exhibition was through the following channels:

- Advertisement on Council's website – Have Your Say
- Council's eNewsletter – April edition
- Social Media (Facebook, LinkedIn and Localised)

- Advertising and Mayor's message - Bush Telegraph, Galston & Glenorie News, Dural Roundup, Hornsby Ku-ring-gai Post and Living Heritage
- Advertising included on the rates notices

In addition, there will be:

- Online and telephone surveys
- Site tours for adjoining residents
- Stakeholder meetings
- Outreach to schools and TAFE
- Swing by sessions

### **BUDGET**

The State Government has allocated \$40,000,000 to creating Westleigh Park. The cost to deliver the full scope of works in the draft Master Plan exceeds the grant funding allocation.

The estimated cost of providing the facilities canvassed in the draft Master Plan is \$70,000 for Westleigh Park based on a conservative contingency of 30%. This leaves a shortfall of \$30,000,000. These costs include investigations, approvals, bulk earthworks and associated decontamination and all works associated with the construction of the actual recreation facilities, including the provision of utilities, access roads and associated intersection upgrades.

The financial capacity of Council to manage the operational, maintenance and renewal costs of facilities established based on the full scope of works identified in the draft Master Plan, would not be feasible based on Council's current financial capacity. Financial analysis by Council has indicated that an amount of ongoing expenditure of \$1,200,000 annually would need to be allocated for this purpose.

The implication of the above is that Council would need to develop Westleigh Park in a staged manner.

### **POLICY**

There are no policy implications associated with this Report.

### **CONCLUSION**

The consultation process has identified broad support for the use of the Westleigh Park site for active and unstructured recreation activities. However, the extent and location of some of the activities outlined in the draft plan exhibited by Council was questioned, particularly:

- The length and type or grade of mountain bike trails
- The location of mountain bike trials (including the link between Hornsby and Westleigh Parks) in endangered ecological communities
- The use of Sefton Road to service the proposals contained in the Master Plan.
- The need for additional community facilities at the site.

Solutions to the above matters may have an impact on the proposed layout of all uses set out in the Westleigh Master Plan and it is considered more time is required to understand the concerns raised



through further consultation with identified interest groups to resolve/clarify the matters raised and identify workable solutions.

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICER**

The officer responsible for the preparation of this Report is the Deputy General Manager – Robert Stephens - who can be contacted on 9847 6665.




ROBERT STEPHENS

Deputy General Manager - Infrastructure and

Major Projects

Infrastructure and Major Projects Division

**Attachments:**

1.  Attachment 1 - Westleigh Park Master Plan
2.  Attachment 2 - Westleigh Park Draft Master Plan - Engagement Outcome Report
3.  Attachment 3 - Micromex Survey Result

File Reference: F2016/00295-003

Document Number: D08194412

## **7 HORNSBY SHIRE PUBLIC DOMAIN GUIDELINES**

---

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- Council, at the March 2021 Ordinary Meeting endorsed the draft Public Domain guidelines for exhibition (IM1/21). The guidelines propose specific improvements to publicly accessible areas in Asquith, Beecroft, Waitara, Thornleigh and West Pennant Hills, proposing various elements to improve the attractiveness and pedestrian accessibility of these places. They also identify general principles that apply to broader areas across the Shire.
- Public exhibition of the guidelines occurred during April and May 2021. Thirteen (13) submissions were received, primarily from residents and community groups relating to Beecroft.
- Following review of submissions an amended final draft Public Domain Guidelines document has been prepared for Council adoption, responding to community feedback.
- A comprehensive Standard Technical Manual is scheduled for preparation during the 2021/22 financial year. This document will outline minimum design and construction standards for future public domain works. It will also ensure a consistent standard of work is delivered by Council and private developers, particularly in the identified town centre areas.
- Minor amendments are also required to the Hornsby Development Control Plan to ensure consistency with the aims of the Public Domain Guidelines. The amendments primarily involve updates to the key principles diagrams in the DCP.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT Council:

1. Adopt the Public Domain Guidelines attached to Deputy General Managers Report No. IM7/21 as the policy position of Council.
2. Note the preparation of a Standard Technical Manual which is included in the 2021/22 Delivery Plan to control the minimum construction standards and aesthetic outcomes of future public domain works undertaken by Council and private developers.
3. Endorse the preparation of associated amendments to the key diagrams in the Hornsby Development Control Plan be prepared to provide consistency with the Public Domain Guideline works for Asquith, Beecroft, Waitara, Thornleigh and West Pennant Hills.

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this Report is to update Council on the Public Domain Guidelines (PDG) following community consultation and to seek formal adoption of the Hornsby Shire Public Domain Guidelines, as new policy.

## BACKGROUND

At the March 2021 Ordinary Meeting Council resolved that the:

1. *Draft Public Domain Guidelines attached to the Deputy General Manager's Report No. IM1/21 be placed on public exhibition for a period of 42 days.*
2. *Results of the consultation process be reported to Council at the first available opportunity.*

## DISCUSSION

The Public Domain Guidelines (PDG) are included at Attachment 1 and provide typical controls for public space throughout the shire as well as site-specific proposals for Key Projects within nominated Study Areas – housing strategy precincts in Asquith, Beecroft, Waitara, Thornleigh and West Pennant Hills. The PDG provide design controls to guide the high-quality delivery of existing Hornsby Development Control Plan (Hornsby DCP) controls and does not propose zoning amendments or land use changes.

### Exhibition

The Draft PDG was placed on public exhibition through March and April 2021 for consultation prior to this Report, via:

- 42-day exhibition period on Council's Have Your Say website (commencing 10 March 2021)
- Local print publication advertisements: Late March/ early April editions of the Bush Telegraph, Hornsby Ku-Ring-Gai Post, Galston and Glenorie News and the Dural Roundup
- April news issued to 29,358 subscribers
- Two social media posts on Council's Facebook page (15 March and 16 April 2021)
- Presentation as requested by Beecroft residents (29 April 2021)

### Submissions received

Thirteen (13) formal submissions were received from both private residents and interested community groups resulting in some 46 suggestions being considered for amendment to the final document. A schedule of all issues raised is included as Attachment 2 to this Report.

In summary, the community feedback:

- Generally supported the creation of the PDG document
- Predominantly related to the Beecroft study area and focused on:
  - Current development proposals at 5 Wongala Crescent
  - Concerns with future traffic implications on Hannah Street, Wongala Crescent and Chapman Avenue
  - Concerns that the PDG will require expensive land acquisition
  - Concerns that the proposals in the PDG will affect property values

- Included requests to expand the scope of the guidelines and comments calling for additional coordination with stakeholders and the need to incorporate the PDG into the Hornsby DCP.

### **Response to submissions**

Responses to the items raised during the public exhibition are provided below.

#### ***5 Wongala Crescent Beecroft***

The submissions regarding the current development proposal at 5 Wongala Crescent are the subject of a current Development Application (DA20/2021). This DA is being assessed by Council's Planning Division in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act. It is not considered appropriate to respond to this specific development proposal at this time. The recommendations of the guidelines to create a pedestrian plaza space in this site will only be applicable to this site after adoption of the PDG and subsequent amendment to the Hornsby DCP. It is recommended that no change is made to the PDG.

#### ***Traffic management changes, Beecroft***

A few submissions raised concerns with potential future traffic management changes on Hannah Street, Wongala Crescent and Chapman Avenue. It is noted that all projects identified in the PDG are subject to detailed design and traffic investigations which will be undertaken at the time of the project proceeding to development. It is therefore recommended no changes are made to the guidelines.

#### ***Land acquisition concerns***

Concerns that the Key projects in Beecroft will require expensive land acquisition by Council. It is noted that the PDG do not propose land acquisition. The guidelines simply provide guidance on how publicly accessible land may be developed. It is therefore not recommended that the PDG are amended in response to these submissions.

#### ***Impact on property values***

Several submissions raised concerns that property values could be impacted due to proposed changes put forward in the PDG. As there is no proposal to rezone any private land, it is not considered that the recommendations in the PDG have bearing on the value of these development sites. For these reasons it is recommended that there is no change to the guidelines in response to this matter.

#### ***Expand scope of PDG***

Several respondents requested an extension of the scope of guidelines to cover a broader area than the detailed study areas in Asquith, Waitara, Beecroft, Thornleigh and West Pennant Hills. The initial scope of the guidelines was set with reference to these Housing Strategy Precincts where significant development is expected in the foreseeable future. The guidelines can be applied to areas beyond those nominated. Site-specific key projects are targeted to be in the housing strategy areas and associated local centre as these are the places where significant growth is expected. It is not recommended that the PDG are amended to respond to this request.

#### ***Calls for additional coordination with stakeholders:***

Regarding the requests for additional coordination with stakeholders such as TfNSW and NSW Health, it is noted that considerable consultation has occurred throughout the preparation of the guidelines. It is noted that further consultation will occur when relevant key projects are being developed. For these reasons it is not recommended that the PDG are amended in response to these requests.

### ***Hornsby Development Control Plan***

A few respondents noted the need to incorporate the PDG into Hornsby DCP. The main purpose of the PDG is to provide information to create quality public spaces. However, it is noted that minor amendments are also required to the Hornsby DCP to ensure consistency with the aims of the PDG. The amendments primarily involve updates to the key principles diagrams in the Hornsby DCP.

#### ***Amendments to the PDG***

Nine (9) amendments are proposed to the PDG based on community responses and are summarised below:

- Addition of references and coordination with the Smoke Free Environment Act 2000 and Council's Smoke-Free Policy; Designing with Country discussion paper in relation to incorporating Indigenous Art; Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles; and Council's Employment Land Study and Economic Development and Tourism Strategy.
- Minor amendments to graphics including clearer reference to Beecroft heritage items, clearer notes regarding parking at West Pennant Hills and incorrect pocket park reference at Beecroft.
- Inclusion of an alternate pedestrian bridge solution at Thornleigh pending future TfNSW coordination.

#### **FUTURE WORK**

The 2021/22 Delivery Plan includes the preparation of a Standard Technical Manual. This document would provide standard construction details for the delivery of public domain works and the installation of associated public infrastructure.

The standardisation of construction methods will allow for greater certainty in the costing of public domain projects, provide additional information for Council Assessment Officers to use in Conditions of Consent for Development Applications and will aid in the provision of consistent public domain materials and aesthetic outcomes throughout the Shire.

#### **BUDGET**

There are no budget implications arising from this report.

#### **POLICY**

When adopted the Public Domain Guidelines will form a Policy document that identifies design controls for works in public domain areas that include roads, parks and other publicly accessible lands. These include works undertaken by Council or private developers.

Should Council endorse the PDGs, it is also appropriate that minor amendments be prepared to the Hornsby DCP to ensure consistency with the aims of the PDGs. The amendments involve updates to the key principles diagrams in Hornsby DCP.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The Public Domain Guidelines include both generic controls to guide the development of the public domain across all urban areas of Hornsby Shire as well as specific projects within the nominated five housing strategy areas where major development is expected to occur; Asquith, Waitara, Beecroft, Thornleigh and West Pennant Hills.

The Guidelines outline the typical streetscape treatments to be applied to urban areas and town centres, with guidance provided on design principles, material selection, furniture selection and the incorporation of a range of existing and recently adopted Council Policies.

They also work in tandem with the existing Hornsby DCP. The PDG provides a level of detail that the DCP is unable to provide with site-specific design controls and minimum requirements proposed to guide the future design of high-quality public spaces.

#### **RESPONSIBLE OFFICER**

The officer responsible for the preparation of this Report is the Manager Major Projects, Infrastructure and Major Projects – Richard Minter - who can be contacted on 9847- 6677.

ROBERT STEPHENS

Deputy General Manager - Infrastructure and  
Major Projects  
Infrastructure and Major Projects Division

#### **Attachments:**

1. Attachment 1 - Submission - Hornsby Public Domain Guidelines - Rev H for General Meeting - 09/06/2021
2. Attachment 2 - Public Domain Guidelines consultation summary for Report - 21/06/2021

File Reference: F2018/00311-002  
Document Number: D08188253

## **8 HORNSBY PARK MASTER PLAN - RESULTS OF THE PUBLIC EXHIBITION**

---

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- The Hornsby Park Masterplan was publicly exhibited from 21 April to 2 June inclusive.
- There was a high level of support for the draft Master Plan's Vision; the balance of 'active' and 'passive' recreation activities and the balance of restoring and protecting the natural environment whilst also providing a diverse range of recreation activities.
- Key areas that the community identified with include:
  - The Canopy Skywalk and walking tracks specifically designed to minimise impact on the environment
  - Passive recreation spaces including green open space and bushland areas
  - Adventure and water-based recreation opportunities, particularly among younger residents.
- There were several points of conflict in the feedback. These included:
  - The proposed alignment of the Canopy Skywalk and potential impact on neighbouring residents.
  - Differing preferences for uses of the park and between wanting to enjoy these activities and protect the natural flora and fauna.
  - Tension between limiting private vehicle access to the park but also ensuring measures are in place to minimise traffic impacts on local streets. There was a high level of support across all feedback channels for a shuttle bus.
  - Differing preferences for delivery sequencing – the Canopy Skywalk, the Quarry Void, Old Man's Valley and mountain biking trails were all raised as preferences.
- A decision to develop Old Mans Valley first will need to be mindful that the scale and intensity of proposed uses does not prejudice the development and use of the wider iconic parkland.
- Having regard to the community feedback several changes are recommended to the Master Plan (Attachment 1). These include:
  - Relocation of the Canopy Skywalk to minimise impacts on adjoining residents
  - Minor modifications of the general layout of uses in Old Mans Valley
  - Inclusion of wording in the Master Plan to reflect the desired approach to intergenerational or all-ages play provision.
  - Inclusion of wording in the Master Plan to reflect the desired approach of third-party involvement in the provision of adventure recreation.

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT Council:

1. Note the contents of Deputy General Managers Report No. IM10/21.
2. Adopt the Hornsby Park Master Plan, subject to the changes outlined in Deputy General Managers Report No. IM10/21.
3. Notify submitters and the various stakeholders involved in the public exhibition of Council's decision.

**ITEM 8**



## PURPOSE

The purpose of this Report is to present the results of the public exhibition of the Draft Hornsby Park Master Plan; to outline issues and responses arising from the exhibition; and to present recommendations for changes to the Master Plan.

## INTRODUCTION

Hornsby Park comprises approximately 60 hectares of bushland and open space surrounding Hornsby Quarry which is located approximately 1km west from the town centre. In addition to the quarry void, the site is home to several features of historical and community interest, including early settler relics, the State Heritage listed Old Man's Valley Cemetery (Higgins Family Cemetery), remnant buildings of the quarry crusher plant and the existing upper Hornsby Park aquatic centre.

The Quarry itself has been closed for safety reasons since the late 1990's. Very few people have had the opportunity to appreciate its astonishing beauty and the natural bushland surrounding it. Transforming the site into a major recreational destination with the uses proposed in the Draft Master Plan will allow residents and visitors to enjoy the stunning landscape, ecological communities and history that make this location so special.

The aim for Hornsby Park is to cater for, and balance, the diverse needs of the community to provide a choice of experiences which range from active and passive recreation, adventure, social places and quiet areas to reflect in a natural setting.

Hornsby Park represents a once-in a generation opportunity to create a parkland that will be genuinely city shaping for the Hornsby Shire. The park offers every opportunity to be an attraction not only for the people of Hornsby, but the wider community. The full realisation of such a significant park will require bold, innovative and big picture decision-making that will inevitably challenge localised thinking and interests.

Importantly, the environmental and cultural sensitivity of the site is such that this diversity of opportunity and experience will necessarily preclude any one recreational activity dominating the park or compromising other activities and experiences.

Once the Master Plan is finalised and adopted by Council, detailed design of the individual elements within the Park will begin. Part 5 (Review of Environmental Factors) and/or Part 4 (development applications) approvals under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act will then be sought. Further community consultation will be an integral part of the approval process.

## BACKGROUND

At the April 2021 General Meeting, Council considered Deputy General Manager's Report IM2/21 and resolved to:

1. *Endorse the public exhibition of the Draft Master Plans for Hornsby and Westleigh Parks for a period of 42 days.*
2. *Acknowledge that a financially responsible approach requires that the projects be staged commensurate with available funding.*
3. *Acknowledge that the estimated cost of both projects and more importantly Council's ability to cover operational, maintenance and renewal costs means that there will be a need to focus on the delivery of one project.*

4. *Confirm that it wishes to focus on the delivery of Hornsby Park and for this to be expressed in the messaging associated with the public exhibition.*
5. *Require the results of the public exhibition to be reported to the July General Meeting of Council.*

This report deals with the results of the public exhibition for Hornsby Park. The outcome of the Westleigh Park public exhibition is the subject of Deputy General Manager's Report No. IM9/21. The draft Master Plan is a high-level, schematic document that seeks to provide an overall vision for the site and sets out the types of suitable uses and activities that Council proposes to deliver within the park.

The exhibited draft Master Plan was informed by several technical studies and set out the desired uses of Hornsby Park including:

- Old Mans Valley (OMV) – creation of a major arrival hub for the whole park (including car and coach parking, as well as a potential shuttle connection to the quarry) and a venue for active and passive recreation facilities with a strong focus on meeting local community needs (a sport field and night training, a space to support events, café, picnic area and district level play space, including water play).The Quarry Void – establishment of a major parkland oriented to the eastern diatreme wall and including a sweeping all-access path leading to a large event lawn, a major informal recreation lawn fronting a freshwater lake, a wetlands cascade on the southern perimeter and a lakeside amenity building. A major lift on the quarry's north wall provides a shorter accessible route to the quarry floor.
- The Crusher Plant – adaptive recreational/cultural re-use of the building and the development of adventure recreation and associated outdoor spaces.
- Southwest Platform – long term potential for a more secluded facility close the National Park with options for an educational and/or eco sensitive accommodation focus.
- The Higgins Family Cemetery – restoration of the cemetery with an informal lawn space adjoining and connecting paths to the Quarry Void and the Crusher Plant.
- Vehicle access and circulation – private vehicle and coach access to Old Mans Valley from Peats Ferry Road with shuttle bus or similar access from Old Mans Valley to the Quarry Void. Quarry Road would provide vehicle access to the Crusher Plant.
- Pedestrian and cycle access – path and stair access from old Hornsby Park to Old Mans Valley (incorporating the Higgins Family and Depression era Heritage Steps) linking to a network of trails connecting to the Quarry Void and the Berowra Valley National Park. The potential for an all-access canopy walk entry from Coronation Street along southern face of the Aquatic Centre to Old Mans Valley was proposed to create a dramatic arrival experience in the long term and provide a springboard for accessible access throughout the entire site.
- Bushland Restoration – conservation and comprehensive rehabilitation of the park's bushland to enhance ecological values - including connecting fragmented islands of the rare Blue Gum Diatreme Forest.
- Southwest Platform – long term potential for a more secluded facility close the National Park with options for an educational and/or eco sensitive accommodation focus.

## DISCUSSION

The draft Master Plan was exhibited from 21 April to 2 June 2021 inclusive. The feedback from the public exhibition was coordinated by Elton Consulting and resulted in the preparation of ***Hornsby Park Draft Master Plan Outcomes Report*** (2021), which is included at Attachment 2.

In addition to Elton Consulting, Micromex Research & Consulting was commissioned to undertake a two-stage community survey utilising telephone recruitment followed by an online e-contact with Hornsby Shire residents. This research focused on resident:

- Views on the range of possible uses and activities in the Park
- Views on access options for the site
- Attitudes towards the Draft Master Plan
- Views on the balancing of macro-themes which informed the Plan.

The Micromex survey provided a statistically valid, broad-based deliberative and robust understanding of community sentiment towards the Hornsby Park project. The survey outcomes should be read in conjunction with the information obtained from Elton's work.

The survey was undertaken in two-stages, with 700 residents contacted by telephone followed by online recontact with 399 of these persons to seek more in-depth responses.

The purpose of the two-stage design was:

The Stage 1 phone survey provided initial responses that reflect the broad community interest in terms of:

- Frequency of outdoor recreation activities and whether more/same/less of each is required in the Hornsby Shire
- Familiarity of the Plan
- Likely future usage

The Stage 2 online survey included images/videos and links to plans to generate more considered responses regarding level of appeal of the proposed options, suggestions for additional features and likely future usage (which could be compared to Stage 1).

The following sections summarise the broad issues and conclusions arising from the work undertaken by Micromex and Elton Consulting.

### **Micromex Survey Results**

The following sections summarise the broad issues and conclusions arising from the work undertaken by Micromex and Elton Consulting.

#### ***Micromex Survey Results***

A copy of the Micromex Survey results is included in Attachment 3 and summarised below under the following headings:

Feelings towards the Master Plan

- Familiarity with the Plan
- Visitation
- Most appealing aspects

- Least appealing aspects
- Appeal of specific features
- Suggestions
- Method of travel
- Hop-on/hop-off shuttle bus

#### ***Familiarity with the Plan***

- The initial phone survey found 54% of respondents are at least somewhat familiar with the plans for the current Hornsby Quarry site.
- Awareness of Council's plans was greatest amongst older residents (aged 45+), ratepayers, those living in Ward A, and those that have lived in the area for more than 20 years.
- 29% of residents claim to have visited the Hornsby Quarry site or surrounding bushland in the last 12 months.

#### ***Visitation***

- Those living in the catchment suburbs of Hornsby/Asquith/Waitara (and those in Wards A and B) are significantly more likely than other residents to have visited the Hornsby Quarry site in the past 12 months.
- The various sample methods (telephone/online) found that 56-58% of respondents would visit the site at least once a month. This figure increased marginally to 59% after viewing the draft master plan video and other available material.

#### ***Most Appealing aspect of the Master Plan (Unaided)***

- The most appealing aspects of Hornsby Park for residents are the 'parks, bushland and green open spaces' as well as the 'walking tracks' and 'canopy walks' (with a net total of 33% mentioning the 'walking tracks' and 'canopy walk').

#### ***Least Appealing aspect of the Master Plan (Unaided)***

- The least appealing aspects of Hornsby Park are transport related, including concerns around congestion and availability of parking.

#### ***Appeal of specific features (Aided)***

- Over 60% of residents indicated they consider 'walking tracks specifically designed to minimise impact on the environment' and 'passive recreation spaces' very appealing.
- 27% indicated 'e-bikes' appealing.
- Proposed boutique accommodation on site was less appealing and gained a polarised response with 26% indicating it is 'Not at all appealing' (well above all other options) and 18% indicating it is 'Very appealing'.
- Females, younger residents, and non-ratepayers are significantly more likely to find bike tracks specifically designed to minimise environmental impacts to be more appealing.
- Younger residents find adventure recreation options and having a user pays system for certain adventure recreation features to be significantly more appealing.

- Those living in the key catchment suburbs of Hornsby/Asquith/Waitara are more likely than other residents to find passive recreation spaces appealing, and those with children living at home, and newcomers to the area find active recreation spaces significantly more appealing.
- Residents in Ward B find being able to use the lake for purposes such as paddle crafts, model boats, etc. significantly more appealing.
- Those that are likely to visit the Hornsby Park site frequently in the future are significantly more likely than other residents to find walking tracks, passive recreation spaces, bike tracks and active recreation spaces to be more appealing.
- Residents that have visited the site in the last 12 months are significantly more likely to find protection and improvement of bushland areas appealing.
- Those that are likely to visit the Hornsby Park site frequently in the future are significantly more likely than other residents to find adventure recreation options, the user pays system and availability of e-bikes more appealing.

### ***Suggestions***

- 34% had no suggestions for additional features, attractions or activities at Hornsby Park. For those that did, cafes and food venues, spaces for children and having a variety of sports facilities/active recreation spaces were the most common suggestions.

### ***Method of Travel***

- The majority of residents (91%) suggested that if they were to visit Hornsby Park, they would be most likely to get there via private car. Residents in Ward B are more likely to walk or cycle to the Park if they were to visit.
- Residents that plan to visit Hornsby Park frequently are significantly more likely to suggest they would walk along footpaths/bushland tracks or cycle on roads/footpaths to travel to the site.

### ***Hop-on/hop-off Shuttle Bus***

- Overall, 36% of residents would be willing to pay a fee for Council to operate a hop- on/hop-off shuttle bus service within the Park at peak times, with older residents and those without children being more willing to pay for this service.

### ***Feeling towards the Master Plan***

- 85% of residents believe the draft Master Plan for Hornsby Park has a good balance of 'active' and 'passive' recreation activities, and 83% believe the Park has a good balance of restoring and protecting the natural environment whilst also providing a diverse range of recreation activities.
- Those that plan to visit the site frequently in the future are significantly less likely than other residents to believe the draft Master Plan gives too much priority to 'active' recreation activities.
- Although not significant, those that plan to visit Hornsby Park frequently are marginally more likely than other residents to believe the draft Master Plan has a good balance of restoring and protecting the natural environment whilst also providing a diverse range of recreation activities.

### **Elton Thematic Survey**

Elton consulting undertook a qualitative thematic analysis which reports on themes identified during the consultation process the firm carried out. The results of this qualitative analysis are summarised below. The themes were derived from several data sources including:

- Two swing-bys (420 people)
- On line survey (487 surveys completed in full or part)
- Stakeholder meetings (60 attendees across six meetings)
- Council Advisory Committees (HATSICC, BMAC, HAC and ESAC)
- Site tours (74 people across three tours)
- Written submissions (101)
- The Community Deliberative Forum (Two meetings)

Elton concluded that most people engaged in their process were overwhelming supportive of the draft Master Plan and the ideas and activities that it outlines. Notably, there was high level support for:

- Ensuring that the park is accessible to all users and visitors
- The proposed shuttle bus service
- Limiting cars on site
- The canopy skywalk
- Acknowledging, celebrating and educating visitors about indigenous, geological, European and scientific history, including by using indigenous names for locations, pathways and tracks
- Bushwalking trails and mountain biking trails
- Swimming in the lake
- Ensuring adequate space for passive recreation

Typical comments were "...be ambitious – this has the potential to be a major attraction for Sydney" "Great plans" "I look forward to seeing the site developed into a destination everyone can enjoy"

### **People expressed a desire to protect**

- the natural environment particularly native flora and fauna, such as the powerful owl
- the natural beauty of the site (from too many visitors)

Elton's analysis highlighted a number of conflicts that need to be addressed and managed. These include:

- Balance of passive vs active recreation
- Balance of walking and Mountain Biking trails
- Benefits to residents vs out of area visitors
- Dog friendly vs prohibiting dogs – not high numbers but arose organically and evenly split between the two
- Adventure recreation vs natural environment and impact

- Protecting neighbours from the impact of noise, crowds and traffic and congestion from increased visitation

The engagement process raised views in relation to the various locations within the Master Plan - the Quarry Void, Old Mans Valley, the Crusher Plant, the South-west platform and circulation and access.

#### **Quarry Void**

- Support for swimming, water activities, and equipment hire, such as canoes, to enjoy the water
- Mix of support and tension about adventure recreation activities such as rock climbing due to environmental considerations
- Concerns about events and management of crowds and traffic, noise and visual impacts but supportive of events – just concerned about how they will be managed.
- Support for activating it as a community space (including events, festivals, markets etc.)
- Need for shade
- Activities within the void resonated with people

#### **Old Mans Valley**

- Support for it being a central point of arrival but concerned about traffic impacts
- Sense of arrival and destination is important (concerned about how “busy” it will be)
- Support for a children’s play area and nearby café
- Tension between passive recreation and the provision of a sporting field – in the survey a sports field was the most popular but also the least favoured
- Concerns that a sporting field will be too noisy and not welcoming
- Synthetic grass concerns – environmental issues and enjoyment for passive recreation
- Survey reflected the notion of a biking destination – bike hire, mountain biking

#### **Crusher Plant**

- Support to maintain industrial heritage and incorporating machinery into an alternative use to acknowledge its history
- Support for café or restaurant with roof top seating
- Support for an education centre or community space that could have different uses
- Acknowledgement that Crusher Plant and South Western Platform could be utilised by commercial operators to provide an income stream to contribute towards maintaining the park
- Survey responses supported adventure recreation, mountain bike trails and café

#### **South West Platform**

- Mixed response across all feedback channels to the proposals for accommodation, however, there was more support for camping over permanent accommodation

### Access and Circulation

- Support for the canopy skywalk (with some adjustment of the route to avoid potential/perceived neighbour impact)
- Shuttle bus support

### Other matters

There was a high level of support for using indigenous names, as well as celebrating other aspects of the site's history and significance.

The essence of this suggestion is that the original 'pre-contact' landscape was a rich and special place for our First Peoples, and as such, we have a significant opportunity as a 'Country healing' gesture, to re-name the Park and areas within the Park (such as Old Mans Valley) with names reflecting the original landscape. With a sensitive approach, we can also retain names to pay respect to European heritage of the site.

The consultant team working on the detailed design for the site, includes Indigenous Design Practitioners who will work with Traditional Owners and HATSICC to ensure that Hornsby Park incorporates Aboriginal knowledge and cultural values and is Designed with Country.

### The Community Deliberative Forum

The Community Deliberative Forum (CDF) was first established for the Hornsby Park project in 2017 when residents were randomly recruited from the Hornsby community. There were three CDF workshops held between February and June 2017 and a further workshop in October 2018. This year there were two workshops in April and May (with up to 8 (or 67%) of the originally recruited members attending).

The CDF is a structured opportunity for informed and inclusive public engagement, designed to facilitate dialogue among residents from diverse backgrounds and between residents and policy makers.

Deliberative Community Forums seek to discover what people think about an issue after they have been engaged deeply and with multiple, alternative perspectives. These forums provide the resources selected residents need to develop an opinion informed by relevant facts, expert information, and an understanding of how issues and policies affect others in their community.

The Deliberative Forum made the following observations about the Master Plan:

- Members were generally supportive of the draft Master Plan and ideas that were being explored
- The canopy tree walk was considered extremely important
- Members understood and expressed their sentiment around what a special place where something special and unique can happen.
- Saw it building on the Bushland Shire tagline
- Access of critical importance to get right, and to be planning for large visitation numbers
- They were keen for the park to be accessible/ activated at night with concerts at Christmas for example
- Support for adventure recreation



- Consensus for there to be an emphasis on adrenalin-type activities. This initiated conversations about what these could be. Suggestions included bungee jumping over the quarry void, zip lines and abseiling. Members expressed interest in high ropes over the water.
- Adventure recreation seen as an important unique offering of the site
- Members thought that Old Mans Valley (OMV) shouldn't be considered as primarily a sporting venue but wanted to make sure that other activities such as yoga and informal activities such as kicking a ball around would be possible.
- The Forum saw Westleigh Park as where the concentrated sport needed to be and OMV as a relaxing backyard
- Saw mountain biking as an important attractor to Hornsby and a unique activity that other LGAs don't offer - as a result, the connection to Westleigh was important
- Construction of mountain bike trails needs to be empathetic to wildlife and natural environment
- Members understood the resources needed and budget restrictions
- Celebrating the site's history
- All members agreed that extra attention and detail needs to be placed on adequately celebrating the diversity of the site's history

The CDF raised some ideas for the project team to consider:

- Access, circulation and car parking

Members spoke at length about the traffic congestion that would be generated by the park, and expressed concern about:

- ensuring the number of cars that enter the park are minimised
- traffic impacts on neighbours
- congestion on local roads

As a result, there was a lively and creative discussion that canvassed the following solutions:

- On demand buses
- Promoting car parking areas within and around the Hornsby CBD and encouraging connection with the shuttle bus/ walking
- Any other underutilised parking areas

Members also reflected how important signage from these areas will be to assist with navigating from the Town Centre to the Park's entrances.

The CDF also considered the following matters from the engagement process:

#### ***Resident vs Non-resident benefits***

When reflecting on feedback captured via other channels about residents wanting some recognition or preferential treatment in comparison to visitors from outside the LGA, the CDF members thought that the only realistic option to explore was free parking.

***Mountain Biking on site***

CDF members agreed unanimously that mountain biking was an important activity that made Hornsby a unique area and expressed a sense of pride. As such their view was it should be supported as much as possible, taking into consideration impact on native vegetation. They were particularly supportive of the link between Hornsby and Westleigh Parks and the opportunity for use by young families.

They also echoed the wider community's concern about the importance of minimising the shared tracks and trails between walkers and mountain bikers.

***Quarry Void***

There was no consensus about swimming in the lake – as there was an almost 50/50 divide between those who supported and those that thought the barriers were too great to overcome in addition to safety implications. However, there was unanimous support for other forms of water activities.

***Old Mans Valley***

Overuse at Old Mans Valley was expressed as being a risk to the arrival experience as this is important and needs to live up to its potential.

In terms of the sporting fields, of the Shire's needs for additional sportsgrounds was acknowledged, and a compromise was suggested for the field to be dedicated to juniors, so that other important elements could be incorporated such as a base for adventure recreation, café and bike hire.

***Adventure recreation***

There was a unified sense that adventure recreation is an important element in making Hornsby Park a unique experience, and that it should be dotted across the entire site, linked where possible while maintaining the integrity of the bush. It was also seen as an income stream for Council to assist with the Park's ongoing costs.

Members also expressed that adventure recreation was important in providing activities for young people and suggested specific engagement with them during detailed design.

***Sequencing of delivery***

There was a split between members preferencing either Old Mans Valley or the quarry void. In the end, there was unanimous agreement that the canopy skywalk should be the first piece of infrastructure delivered.

**Summary of main issues/findings from Micromex and Elton**

In summary Elton identified from its online survey and the written submissions that the main issues were:

- The balance of active vs passive recreation through the site
- The canopy skywalk alignment
- Tracks trails and paths vs environmental management and the Powerful Owl

This compares to the Micromex survey, which concluded that:

- 85% of residents believe that there is a good balance of active and passive recreation activities
- 83% of residents believe there is a good balance of restoring and protecting the natural environment whilst also providing a diverse range of recreation activities

In overall terms there is a significant amount of support for the Master Plan and the following sections should be considered as providing opportunities to further refine the experiences that will be offered as detailed design and project delivery commence. Some of the commentary will provide information that supports decisions on management of the park as it opens to the public.

#### **Matters arising from the public exhibition**

This section addresses issues arising from the public exhibition, including those raised by Council's environmental advisory groups. The issues include:

- The balance of uses proposed for Old Mans Valley
- Synthetic vs grass surface for the sports field in Old Mans Valley
- The canopy skywalk
- The all abilities access shared path (Green Line)
- Tracks and Trails
- Play opportunities
- Adventure recreation opportunities.

#### ***The balance of uses in Old Mans Valley***

The issues raised included:

- Opportunities for passive recreation
- Opportunities for sporting activities
- Opposition to sporting activities
- Restricted parking capacity

#### Response

It is acknowledged that there is high demand for open space in the Shire. Old Mans Valley is one such 'contested' open space where, the arrival gateway to an iconic new parkland, meeting current and changing informal recreation needs of an emerging Town Centre population growth and satisfying today's general sporting demands are functions that the plan is attempting to accommodate.

The currently adopted Plan of Management (2015) nominates a sports field for Old Mans Valley and this has been carried forward in the draft Master Plan. Whilst active sports are arguably inconsistent with the creation of an iconic nature-based park, the Master Plan acknowledges and accommodates this use, as it was nominated prior to development of the vision under the Draft Master Plan.

The feedback from the community consultation and engagement process identifies that the local community see the Quarry Void as a priority destination. The experience of OMV as part of that experience when accessing and leaving the Void will be key to their enjoyment and at the very least suggests that sports in the locality will have to be managed in a manner that is unlikely to compromise the recreation and arrival experiences of visitors to the wider park. This will be further developed through the detailed design and approval phases.

Car parking space is limited to the edges of the park at OMV, consistent with modern park planning models worldwide. This provides a greater opportunity to protect the valuable bushland areas that exist on the site and maximise the opportunities that can be developed on the disturbed portion of the site.

### Recommendation

The general layout for Old Mans Valley proposed in the exhibited Master Plan be retained other than minor changes associated with the type of surface that could be accommodated for the sports field, its realignment and improved connections between the playground and the sports field area.

#### ***Synthetic Surface Versus Natural Grass***

The issues raised included:

- Opposition to use of synthetic 'turf' due to a multitude of reasons including micro-plastic shedding, rubber infill shedding, heat island contribution
- Support from sporting groups for a surface that can withstand more than 25 hours/week of programmed use which is the capacity of natural turf

### Response

OMV plays an important role in Hornsby Park both for active and passive recreation as well as an arrival point. Careful consideration is required on how to balance these issues and appropriate surfaces for the OMV sports field.

Synthetic turf is largely a single purpose surface that does not easily accommodate other informal uses, such as casual recreation that may be popular given forecast demographics of the emerging Hornsby Town Centre population.

There is an acknowledgement that intensive use sport may result from a synthetic surface and as such carparking demand may be high at certain times.

While difficult, a decision was made to include a synthetic surface in the draft Master Plan to cater for intensive sporting use, including training and competitive sports, alongside informal uses associated with a 'village green' function demand that is likely to arise from the redevelopment of the Hornsby Town Centre. Council will be required to balance the overall uses of Old Mans Valley in terms of design, development and operational management.

In respect to operational management considerations, the current view is that the field should only be available for night time training during the week, Saturday and Sunday mornings, and a spread of hours during the day – Monday to Friday. The field will be lit, and the timing of use would need to avoid the peak operating times of the remainder of the Park, particularly the quarry void. It is possible that the actual spread of hours may exceed the capacity of a grass surface, which is 25 hours.

If pursued, the environmental impacts associated with a synthetic field will have to be managed in line with the Park's expressed sustainability goals. Suffice to say, the heat island effect will be a challenge to manage during the summer months.

### Recommendation

A synthetic 'turf' surface for the playing field be retained as an option within the final Master Plan. This will be subject to normal development approvals and operational management to ensure that its use does not prejudice the development and use of the wider iconic parkland.

#### ***Canopy Skywalk***

The issues raised include:

- Nearby residents raised issues of 'oversight', visitor noise and general disturbance from the alignment of the exhibited Canopy Skywalk

- Overwhelming support from the community as a concept for access and immersion in nature with immediate access from the Hornsby Town Centre
- Some concern raised regarding potential environmental and heritage impacts of the facility

#### Response

The draft Master Plan includes a proposal for a Canopy Skywalk which starts at the Coronation Street/Peats Ferry Road intersection and ends at Old Mans Valley.

The Canopy Skywalk in the Park is considered a critical element of the overall design and has clearly resonated with the community. There is, however, merit in reconsidering the alignment of the canopy walk to minimise impacts on adjoining residents. A revised alignment would ideally provide opportunities for visitors to be immersed in nature, mitigating impacts on critical view sheds (to and from the heritage steps and across the quarry void to the west), valuable intact Blackbutt Gully Forest and the Higgins family cemetery.

It is proposed that the current alignment of the Canopy Skywalk be amended to begin at the northern end of the Hornsby Aquatic and Leisure Centre with connections to the Crusher Plant site and Old Mans Valley. Opportunities to secure views or glimpses of views of the quarry void would be desirable. The detailed alignment would be the subject of additional investigations that address the above considerations. Notwithstanding, like iconic walk ways in National Parks, there may be a need to balance these concerns to allow visitors to be immersed into the natural bushland. Construction techniques compatible with the value of the surrounding environment would be required.

#### Recommendation

Amend the exhibited route for the Canopy Skywalk to avoid affecting nearby residents and minimise impact on valuable bushland. A specific alignment to be resolved as part of the detailed design process for Park embellishments.

#### ***All Abilities Access Shared Path (Green Line)***

The issues raised include:

- Potential impacts of pedestrians sharing a path with bicycles
- Potential environmental impacts on bushland and ecological values

#### Response

Council will carefully consider planning and design for the all access (Green Path) to accommodate pedestrians in a safe manner. Bicycle passage around the site will also need to be carefully considered to ensure best levels of safety.

#### Recommendation

No change, noting that the final alignment and design for the Green Path will be subject to further site investigation, survey, detailed design and approvals.

#### ***Tracks and Trails***

The issues raised include potential environmental impacts on bushland and ecological values. There was also a request to separate mountain bike tracks and pedestrian walking paths to avoid conflict.

#### Response

Council will carefully consider planning, design and final alignment for all tracks and mountain bike trails in the Park with a view to ensure that they are appropriately located to minimise impacts on flora

and fauna and to minimise pedestrian/cycle conflicts. These will be publicly exhibited as part of the approval process.

#### Recommendation

No change, noting that the final alignment and design for tracks and trails will be subject to further site investigation, survey, detailed design and development approvals.

#### ***Play Opportunities***

The issues raised include:

- Strong levels of support for inclusion of play in the Park
- Suggestion that Council seek to accommodate 'all-ages' play'

#### Response

Council has engaged leading expert consultants to advise on maximising opportunities for play across the site covered by the Master Plan. There are significant opportunities to provide a mosaic of play opportunities with different themes for different age groups (children to adults). When combined the play spaces could provide a range of opportunities commensurate with a regional parkland.

Council understands the importance of play, and the emerging notion of 'intergenerational play' and our consultants have views on how this may be achieved in the Park.

#### Recommendation

Include wording in the Master Plan to reflect the desired approach to intergenerational play provision.

#### ***Adventure Recreation Opportunities***

The issues raised include:

- Significant support for adventure recreation in the Park
- Concerns raised regarding potential environmental impacts of adventure recreation
- Concern regarding commercial operations in the Park generally
- Ensuring adequate space for passive recreation as well

#### Response

Council will consider the provision of adventure recreation carefully to mitigate any potential impacts. It is anticipated that a commercial in confidence expression of interest will be framed to gauge third party interest in provision of such facilities.

Given the likely operational costs for the Park, appropriate third-party partner involvement, in keeping with overall objectives, will greatly assist in experience delivery and offset costs.

#### Recommendation

Include wording in the Master Plan to reflect the desired approach to adventure recreation provision.

### **CONSULTATION**

The engagement and consultation strategy sought views from a wide cross section of the community on the proposals contained in the draft master plan.

The draft Master Plan was publicly exhibited for a period of 42 days, ending 2 June 2021. Notification of the public exhibition was through the following channels:

- Advertisement on Council's website – Have Your Say
- Council's eNewsletter – April edition
- Social Media (Facebook, LinkedIn and Localised)
- Advertising and Mayor's message - Bush Telegraph, Galston & Glenorie News, Dural Roundup, Hornsby Ku-ring-gai Post and Living Heritage
- Advertising included on the rates notices

In addition, there was:

- Online and telephone surveys
- Site tours for adjoining residents
- Stakeholder meetings
- Swing by sessions

### **POLICY**

There are no policy implications associated with this Report.

### **BUDGET**

The estimated cost of providing the facilities canvassed in the draft Master Plan is \$130,000,000 for Hornsby Park based on a conservative contingency of 30%. These costs include investigations, approvals, bulk earthworks and associated site stabilisation and all works associated with the construction of the actual recreation facilities, including the provision of utilities, access roads and associated intersection upgrades.

The NSW Government has provided \$50,000,000 for the creation of Hornsby Park. The cost to deliver the full scope of works in the draft master plan exceeds the grant funding allocation.

In addition to NSW Government Grant funds, Council has approximately \$30,000,000 of development contributions available to spend on the project, leaving a shortfall of \$40,000,000.

The financial capacity of Council to manage the operational, maintenance and renewal costs of facilities established based on the full scope of works identified in the draft Master Plan, would not be feasible based on Council's current financial capacity. Financial analysis by Council has indicated that an amount of ongoing expenditure of \$1,400,000 annually could be allocated for this purpose.

The implication of the above is that Council would need to focus on developing Hornsby Park in a staged manner.

Initial investigations have identified that a significant proportion of the surface improvements/embellishments proposed for Hornsby Park could be achieved within the limitation posed by the cap on the operational, maintenance and renewal costs.

### **POLICY**

There are no policy implications associated with this Report.

### **CONCLUSION**

The draft Master Plan for Hornsby Park builds on previous consultation/ investigations carried out during the term of the current Council. The community provided some high-level ideas on what they

wanted to see, do and experience at Hornsby Park and helped set the principles to guide the development of the draft Master Plan.

The results of the public exhibition demonstrate that the community is generally supportive of the uses proposed in the draft Master Plan.

The Masterplan is recommended to Council for adoption inclusive of changes as outlined in this report and acknowledging that the valued feedback provided will continue to receive consideration in the detailed design development for park embellishments and operational management of this future iconic parkland.




### **RESPONSIBLE OFFICER**

The officer responsible for the preparation of this Report is the Deputy General Manager, Infrastructure and Major Projects – Robert Stephens - who can be contacted on 9847 6665

ROBERT STEPHENS

Deputy General Manager - Infrastructure and  
Major Projects  
Infrastructure and Major Projects Division

### **Attachments:**

1.  Attachment 1 - Hornsby Park Master Plan
2.  Attachment 2 - Hornsby Park Draft Master Plan Outcomes Report
3.  Attachment 3 - Micromex Survey Result

File Reference: F2016/00295-003

Document Number: D08200927



**11 MAYOR'S NOTES FROM 01 JUNE - 30 JUNE 2021**

---

*Note: These are the functions that the Mayor, or his representative, has attended in addition to the normal Council Meetings, Workshops, Mayoral Interviews and other Council Committee Meetings.*

Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2021 – The Mayor hosted four Citizenship Ceremonies at the Council Chambers in Hornsby.

Friday 4<sup>th</sup> June 2021 – The Mayor attended the Remagine Art Prize Award Ceremony at Wallarobba House in Hornsby.

Saturday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2021 – The Mayor attended the NSW SES Hornsby Awards Ceremony at Thornleigh Community Centre in Thornleigh.

Saturday 19<sup>th</sup> June 2021 – The Mayor attended the roll out of the new Waste Trucks at the Council Depot in Mount Kuring Gai.

Saturday 19<sup>th</sup> June 2021 – The Mayor attended a cut the ribbon at the Official Opening of Belonging Early Learning on Clarke Road in Hornsby.

Saturday 19<sup>th</sup> June 2021 – The Mayor attended the Annual Awards and Reports Meeting of the 1<sup>st</sup> Dural Scouts at Dural Scout Hall in Dural.

Sunday 20<sup>th</sup> June 2021 – The Mayor attended the 70<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Muogamarra Rural Fire Brigade at Asquith Golf Club in Asquith.

Sunday 20<sup>th</sup> June 2021 – The Mayor attended Talent Club Education Sydney Speaking competition at Hornsby RSL in Hornsby.

Sunday 20<sup>th</sup> June 2021 – The Mayor attended the Scouts NSW Sydney North Region Annual Presentation Report at 1<sup>st</sup> Lane Cove Scout Hall in Lane Cove.

Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2021 – The Mayor hosted four Citizenship Ceremonies at the Council Chambers in Hornsby.

File Reference: F2004/07053

Document Number: D08192193

12 BEROWRA POOL

COUNCILLOR MARR TO MOVE:

THAT:

1. Following the September 2021 election, the new Council convene a workshop to consider whether the Berowra Pool should be included on a future project list to attract funding and fulfil ratepayer and community needs.
2. The workshop should include a review of past feasibility studies, reports and analyses by community groups, consultants and Council staff.

**Note from Councillor**

Discussion about a Berowra Pool has been going on for around 40 years and had numerous feasibility studies and business plans indicating support for it. Hornsby Aquatic Centre is full in peak times and many of its patrons are from the north east section of A Ward. There have been discussions relating to the need to expand Hornsby Pool. It is very difficult to swim without a body of water to swim or practice in - unlike most other physical, social and cultural activities.

The Berowra Recreation Needs Analysis (2019) surveyed residents north east of Hornsby and identified residents' opinions on facility needs improvement priorities:

- 60% supported active water facilities (recreation - 33%; lap - 17%; aqua aerobics - 5%; play/splash area - 3%; and swim club - 2%)
- 19% supported parks and playgrounds
- 11% supported outdoor sports
- 8% supported bike/cycling

The Berowra Pool Feasibility Report (2017), which is now public, recommended that *"consistent with previous feasibility studies this Feasibility Report concluded that there would be sufficient user demand to support the operation of a new Berowra Pool"* and *"the estimated visitation (up to 180,000 visits per annum) is approximately three times that of Galston Aquatic and Leisure Centre but less than those proposed by the BDC Study"*.

Council's Operational Plan for 2021/22 (pages 40 and 44) estimates that the costs to run and manage facilities are:

- Two pools and one leisure centre      \$60K      18% population
- 50 ovals and parks      \$8M      25% population (HSC snapshot 2016)

Berowra residents have financially supported Shire-wide residents by paying a levy to fund the

construction of the 2,000 square metre plus Berowra Community and Cultural Facility/Library - valued at \$10 million dollar plus and used by groups from other Wards for large gatherings.

Council residents received over 30 years interest from the Berowra Pool Restricted Asset moneys (\$300K) for operational and capital works - no accumulating interest was paid to the Restricted Asset.

Berowra residents paid more than their fair share of levies and Section 94 funds including levies for all public facilities Shire-wide but few North of Hornsby.

\$3 million from property investments of the \$300K Berowra Pool Restricted Asset was used to finish Hornsby Aquatic Centre and thus benefit Hornsby residents to the detriment of those north of Hornsby.

Local facilities and services are key elements in a sustainability society. They reduce travel times and distances and pollution while encouraging positive community engagement, socialisation and cooperation.

Money earners for Council include rates, levies and Government grants. Pools and indoor sports centres, when managed properly as they are now (and excluding COVID-19 disruptions) also earn money. Ovals, sports fields, parks, libraries, community centres and other services run at a loss.

**Attachments:**

There are no attachments for this report.

File Reference: F2013/00751

Document Number: D08199350

### 13 INVESTMENT IN NON-CARBON INVESTMENTS

---

COUNCILLOR MARR TO MOVE

THAT Council, in developing its next Long-Term Financial Plan, and subject to legislative investment requirements of the NSW State Government for local government, include an assessment of how to transition its investment strategy over time to one directed at complete investment in non-carbon producing investments.

**Note from Councillor**

It is acknowledged that: Council is now in the process of buying 100% renewable electricity for all its needs such as Council building power needs and street lighting.

It is noted that a motion was passed back in 2018 to increase investments in non-carbon producing investments. At that time, around 20% was already being invested in non-carbon producing investments and Council had agreed to increase investment in these products subject to equivalent or better returns being achieved by these investments. Investment has now slipped to around 15%.

It is now generally agreed that it is best practice and usually cheaper not to produce carbon in the first place. This is better than producing it and then remediating it or addressing consequences such as storms, bushfires, changes in climate, loss of arable land and so on.

Non-carbon investment has resulted in advancements in leaps and bounds of sustainable products including power generation, transport, food, recycling and so on.

**Attachments:**

There are no attachments for this report.

File Reference: F2013/00751

Document Number: D08199382

**14 TRAIN AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES NORTH OF HORNSBY**

---

COUNCILLOR MARR TO MOVE

THAT:

1. Council lobby for improvements to train and public transport services north of Hornsby, especially between Berowra, Cowan and Hawkesbury River Stations on weekdays and weekends.
2. The General Manager write to each of the local State and Federal Members of Parliament; the Minister for Transport; and the Secretary of Transport seeking support for, and commitment to, additional services being provided.
3. Council acknowledge that many Newcastle and Central Coast trains pass through these Stations.

**Note from Councillor**

I caught a train to a community meeting at Brooklyn the other weekend. Lots of people, mostly locals and bush walkers got on and off the train at Cowan and Brooklyn. In summer it is packed. I missed the train back to Berowra by 30 seconds. This meant I had 59 minutes and 30 seconds to wait for another train.

Complaints about the poor train service to Cowan and Hawkesbury River (Brooklyn) come up time and time again. With natural environment recreational activities, such as the Great North Walk, boating, canoeing, swimming, eating and drinking, entertaining, social gatherings and so on being a huge attraction that is accessible by train. As well as Hornsby Shire residents, many visitors from the north, south, east and west of Hornsby visit regularly as do those from the Central Coast.

On the other hand, the many locals and River residents need to travel for various reasons including basic needs and services. I am told that parking is the biggest issue in Brooklyn and unfortunately every weekend, Hornsby north east residents are reminded of the ongoing traffic and congestion issues between the Central Coast and Hornsby Shire while trains on the weekend have a one-hour service.

Hornsby Shire and River residents deserve a better public transport service, especially on weekends as do the many tourists who visit from inside or outside our Shire and could use public transport if it was a decent service.

**Attachments:**

There are no attachments for this report.

File Reference: F2004/08724-02  
Document Number: D08199403

**ITEM 14**

**15 RURAL LAND STUDY FORMAL TRANSITION OF RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE NEWLY ELECTED COUNCIL**

---

COUNCILLOR DEL GALLEGO TO MOVE

THAT Council inform the new Council to be elected in September 2021 that the current Council:

1. Has not scrutinised the Rural Land Study, submissions received, environmental impact or any other relevant matters, including associated costs to ratepayers in pursuing further investigations.
2. Notes, and must notify ratepayers, that any investigations to progress recommendations for changes to planning controls by Hornsby Council may be at significant costs to Hornsby Shire ratepayers. Proponents/Landowners led rezoning investigations are at no cost to Local or State Governments.

**Note from Councillor:**

Council is put on notice to inform the newly elected Council that if it resolves to lead any lot size investigations or planning proposal pursuant to recommendations made in the Rural Land Study, then this becomes a 'Council led' initiative with potential significant costs to Hornsby Shire ratepayers.

As an analogy, the Proponent led 'South Dural planning proposal' investigations cost the proponents a significant amount of money. It is not appropriate to provide an estimate in this paper, but certain officers and Councillors may be aware of the broad range of costs incurred, having been involved with the planning proposal process at the time.

The State Government approved a gateway determination on South Dural to proceed with required investigations, conditioned accordingly. One of these conditions was 'at no cost' to government.

The State Government eventually declined the South Dural planning proposal on several grounds including that the proponent was unable to demonstrate that the necessary upgrades to the surrounding road network could be delivered at no cost to government. Estimated costs of the surrounding road network alone was circa \$300 million.

If the newly elected Hornsby Council resolves to lead investigations into the recommendations in the Rural Lands Study for changes to planning controls, would they expect all ratepayers to pay for massive road and infrastructure costs required to support associated increases in development?

I am a rate payer, and my answer is No!

The Rural Land Study received over 300 submissions during the exhibition period.

At a Councillor's briefing on 17 March 2021, a preliminary online overview of the feedback was presented to Councillors. At the time, I expressed the Rural Land Study to be an extremely important document that warranted a much more in-depth, face to face workshop to fully discuss its contents,

submissions received and potential impacts.

It took three months for a scheduled face to face workshop to be arranged on 23 June 2021. That afternoon, Covid 19 emergency restrictions were imposed that required online meeting arrangements to proceed instead of the planned face to face workshop.

No discussions were undertaken, with the majority of Councillors preferring to leave all information and future workshop to the newly elected Council to pursue. A letter is to be sent to all submitters and rural land owners providing an update.

In essence, no in-dept face to face workshop has been undertaken to scrutinise this complex Rural Land Study, its recommendations, environmental impact or any other relevant matters, including associated costs to all ratepayers of Hornsby Shire in pursuing further investigations.

As an example, page 53 of the Rural Land Study - Galston Plateau, recommends that Council investigate opportunities within 400m from the current residential zoned land around Galston village where the zoning of E4 Environmental Living could be introduced, provided land meets principles for place-based planning outlined in the Strategy. The Study recommends a minimum lot size ranging between 5,000sqm-10,000sqm be explored.

Similar examples are included in the Study for Glenorie and Dural. Parts of Arcadia/Fiddletown are also recommended for a possible reduction in the minimum lot size from 10ha minimum to 2ha.

Subject to a full workshop discussion, analysis and formal report from Council Officers for determination, my initial findings indicate that this recommendation:

1. Is not evidenced based due to the absence of economic data that forecasts enhanced tourism activities and future population growth to support the conversion of some agricultural land into smaller lot sizes for housing diversity purposes.
2. Contradicts some NSW government principles, such as:
  - i. NSW government's proposed agritourism and small-scale agriculture development: proposed amendments to support farm businesses and regional economies, clearly specifies on page 4 *"The planning system seeks to protect agricultural land and secure it as a resource for food production for future generations."*  
  
This simply means Agriculture is the priority and low impact agritourism to only support the primary business.
  - ii. Greater Sydney Commission Planning Priority N18 better managing rural areas emphasises 'Rural residential development is not an economic value of the District's rural areas and further rural residential development is generally not supported.'  
  
This simply means 'rural residential' is not a housing diversity in rural areas.
3. Has been addressed adequately by Council's resolution to increase the permitted size of secondary dwellings from 60sqm to 120sqm and retain the control that permits secondary dwellings up to 33% of the floor area of the principal dwelling.  
  
This simply means any increase housing opportunities are addressed by current permissible housing controls without the need for further reduction in lots sizes.

This Council is put on notice of the significant potential impact on ratepayers' funds to pay for further



investigations or planning proposals to progress the recommendation in the Rural Land Study to evaluate reduced allotment sizes in specific rural areas as well as to pay for required road and public infrastructure to support changes.

Council supporting this notice of motion will formally transition this complex Rural Land Study responsibilities to the newly elected Council.

**Attachments:**

There are no attachments for this report.

File Reference: F2018/00162#04

Document Number: D08199907

**ITEM 15**