

**SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS ON ACTION PLAN - This summary table is to be read in conjunction with the Review of Community Submissions Report.**

**6.1 Site Wide Actions**

ISSUE	ACTION	RESPON SIBILITY	PRIORITY	COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS	COMMENTS
<p><b>6.1.1</b> Areas of foreshore are overused and inaccessible</p>	<p><b>A minimum 20m open space zone should be established from the high water mark along all foreshore areas. This zone will be designated for open space/recreation only and no car parking, roads etc will be allowed to occur in the area.</b></p>	GCC	High	<p><b>High level of support for foreshore remediation and open space zone (23 support, 3 opposed).</b></p> <p>Majority of supporting submissions indicated that 20m open space zone should include PCCA, and include measures to ensure no camping in the foreshore area. Some issues raised about precision of measurements for high watermark.</p>	
<p><b>6.1.2</b> There is an inconsistent approach to site-wide foreshore erosion control</p>	<p><b>GCC to arrange for review of areas subject to erosion and formulate remedial action. Any recommendations given should maintain the ideals of this report and make the foreshore accessible as much as possible. Any foreshore works need to be designed to complement the aims and objectives of the <i>Lower Hawkesbury Estuary Management Plan (Harris, et al, 2008)</i>. There needs to be a balance between recreation and establishing foreshore vegetation which plays an important role in stabilisation. The plan should discourage mowing to the waters edge, with a preference given to the use of indigenous plants.</b></p>	GCC	High	<p><b>High level of support for erosion control works generally (26 support, 4 opposed).</b></p> <p>Opposition concerned with issues of ongoing maintenance by agencies. Support favoured appropriate EIS, resident consultation and revegetation. Issues addressed in specific locations (particularly Dark Corner and stabilisation at the boat ramp).</p>	
<p><b>6.1.3</b> Pedestrian network is inconsistent. Patonga Circuit is poorly structured, delineated and underutilised</p>	<p><b>Establish the Patonga Circuit which should follow a clear accessible route throughout the entire foreshore area. It should remain informal in nature and should only be paved or delineated formally in areas surrounding the town centre, or in dune areas where batten and chain paths should be used.</b></p> <p><b>Along Patonga Creek foreshore, introduced gardens and shrub planting should be thinned out to create a more open space and enhance the continuity of foreshore. Where thinning is undertaken, these areas should be revegetated using indigenous plant material based on GCC's Vegetation</b></p>	GCC	Medium	<p><b>General opposition to creation of formalised pedestrian network</b></p> <p>Significant opposition to creation of Patonga Circuit (74 opposed, 27 support). Divided opinion on opening up foreshore public and (53 opposed, 51 support). High level of opposition for formalized beach access (44 opposed, 17 support). High level of opposition to pedestrian access ways (52 opposed, 17 support)</p>	

	<b>Mapping (Bell, 2009). Work to be done in consultation with adjoining residents.</b>				
<b>6.1.4</b> Car parking is inadequate	<b>Areas identified in Section 5 should be designated parking zones. This allows for people who wish to drive to Patonga to “walk the circuit”, to park in a variety of locations directly accessible to the foreshore.</b>	GCC	Medium	<b>High level of opposition to additional car parking in this area (51 opposed, 7 support)</b>	
<b>6.1.5</b> Signage is poor	<b>Create new directional signage for the information board at Patonga. Clearly define areas for visitors e.g. picnic areas, parking and the circuit (aka Patonga Circuit). Signage should include information that highlights the Aboriginal and European history of the area. Locate the directional bollards as suggested by O’Hanlon Design (1995), to clearly define route (refer Appendix E).</b>	GCC	Medium	<b>Significant opposition to new signage across plan area (42 opposed, 11 support).</b>  Signage issues dealt with in specific locations (Dark Corner, Eve Williams Oval, Village Entry, Patonga Beach).	
<b>6.1.6</b> Furniture is generally in a poor condition and is of a variety of styles and materials	<b>Establish simple suite of furniture for Patonga. Selected furniture should be in keeping with the relaxed nature of the village. Remove furniture deemed to be in poor condition and replace with items from new suite. Add more picnic areas and barbecues as per the PoM.</b>	GCC	Medium	<b>High levels of opposition to proposed ‘generic’ street furniture proposed in plan (8 opposed). Generally divided opinion on upgrades to picnic and BBQ areas in plan area.</b>  Issues addressed in specific locations (village entry, Patonga Creek, wharf, boat ramp)	
<b>6.1.7</b> No provision for bicycle parking	<b>Install bicycle parking racks at car parks and playgrounds.</b>	GCC	Medium	<b>Limited submissions but general opposition to bicycle parking as unnecessary.</b>  Very few submissions on this point, but indicated low levels of bicycle traffic in Patonga area.	
<b>6.1.8</b> Weeds have spread in some areas and prevent native vegetation from growing. Some residents tend to plant inappropriate	<b>Engage in better consultation with the community on species selection, explaining the preference for the correct indigenous plant species. Undertake a letterbox drop outlining an appropriate species list and explaining why certain plants (possibly planted by residents) will be removed from foreshore areas to prevent further weed outbreaks. Reinforce the above using poster displays</b>	GCC	High	<b>Generally significant support for weed management in key areas.</b>  Issues of weed management addressed in specific locations (creekline management at oval, bushland upgrade at village entry, erosion control and revegetation works at boat ramp, Dark Corner and along Patonga Beach, Patonga Creek)	

species that are more likely to exacerbate weed outbreak	<b>and strategically located signage. Consider making potential plants freely available to those who are wishing to undertake maintenance within the reserves.</b>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

6.2 Precinct A: Dark Corner

ISSUE	ACTION	RESPON SIBILITY	PRIORITY (% of submissi ons)	COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS (no of submissions in brackets)	COMMENTS
6.2.1 Conservation Management Plan implementation	Ensure that any activities or development in the Dark Corner Precinct are consistent with the CMP. (Refer Appendix D.)	Crown Lands/GC C	8%	<b>General support for CMP (15 support, 3 opposed).</b>  Supporting submissions in favour of all measures (9), strict heritage requirements (3), and removal or repair of damaged building stock (3). Opposing submissions requested no replacements (2) and demolition of existing buildings (1).	Suggest no change to action or responsibility
6.2.2 Existing Permissive Occupancy tenants occupation of cottages	<b>Grant appropriate tenures that allow for the ongoing conservation of the heritage cottages consistent with the CMP and which include a nominated curtilage with adequate public access. Establish curtilages for sites of former cottages to enable future buildings to be erected. The total number of cottages held under tenure should not exceed 10, which is reflective of former occupations.</b>	Crown Lands / GCC	50%	<b>Very high opposition to overall plans for Dark Corner (22 opposed, 3 support).</b>  Objecting submissions suggested a separate planning process for Dark Corner (7), or that the area be returned to bushland, reserve or public access land (8).  <b>Very high opposition to new developments at Dark Corner (74 opposed, 6 support).</b>  High number of submissions rejected any new or commercial developments at Dark Corner (67). Supporting submissions required any new developments to retain original design and materials (4). Suggestions to create an Indigenous cultural centre (1) or a new commercial tourist facility (2) were raised, but would not be supported.  <b>Divided opinion on granting of tenures for existing landowners (5 opposed, 3 support)</b>  Tenures supported for residential use only, and granting of new tenures only in consultation with existing residents.	Suggest changes in accordance with Strategy Review endorsed by CRP.
6.2.3 The existing car park is underutilised and unstructured. Visitors are mostly unaware of it. The proposed redesign of the car park (Cardno 1995) should be reviewed to meet 2012	<b>Refer to PoM for suggested car park layout. Locate a sign at the Patonga Drive turn-off to highlight the location of the car park. Entry signage should encourage access by pedestrians. Prepare best practice guidelines for cottage tenants' vehicle movements on site and incorporate into new tenure agreement, giving consideration to public liability and environmental issues.</b>	GCC / Crown Lands	21%	<b>Divided community opinion on changes to car-parking and access at Dark Corner (26 support, 21 opposed).</b>  All proposals were supported in 17 submissions, but other suggestions included 24-hour resident parking (10), limited access for residents (3), no overnight parking (3), no 4WD access (4) and all parking prohibited (1).	Suggest removal from this precinct and added as action <b>(determine where best fits)</b>

requirements	<del>Restrict 4WD access and emergency/authorised vehicles with signage and upgrading of existing vehicular gate.</del>				
6.2.4 Cottages are located on land classified as being bushfire prone (Category 1)	<b>Bushfire hazard management for the protection of the cottages should be established and maintained in accordance with the Gosford Bush Fire Risk Management Plan (2011) and the Gosford Natural Areas Bushfire Risk Analysis (2007). Consult with residents to inform them about appropriate actions.</b>	GCC /Crown Lands / Cottage tenants	3%	<b>Low number of submissions, generally supported (4 in favour, 2 opposed)</b>  Opposing submissions indicated that bushfire hazard management undertaken by residents is currently sufficient.	Suggest no change to action or responsibility
6.2.5 Beach erosion occurs immediately in front of the cottages with piecemeal repairs	<b>Prior to investigating maintenance or improvement works, consult with Dark Corner Cottage residents about relevant issues to be considered. Seek Identify funding options and for engineered design of retaining wall and associated works to reinstate sea wall where failing to prevent further damage to banks and cottages. Erosion control in accordance with the policies of the Conservation Management Plan (EJE Heritage, 2010). (Refer Appendix D.) Revegetate sandbanks to creek outlet in keeping with native vegetation community. All works need to complement the aims and objectives of the Lower Hawkesbury Estuary Management Plan. Any proposed seawalls retaining works should also be designed in accordance with the Environmentally Friendly Seawalls Guide developed by DECCW. appropriate engineering advice and necessary planning approvals.</b>	GCC /Crown Lands / Cottage tenants	19%	<b>High level of opposition to environmental levy (12 opposed, 1 support)</b>  <b>High level of support for erosion control works (26 support, 4 opposed)</b>  Opposition concerned with issues of ongoing maintenance by agencies. Support favoured appropriate EIS, resident consultation and revegetation. An environmental levy would not be supported.	Suggest changes in accordance with Strategy Review endorsed by CRP.
6.2.6 Tidal movements mean that the cottages can be isolated from the rest of Patonga at periods of high tide and there are subsequently liability issues	<del>Cars other than emergency vehicles should be prevented from accessing the cottages permanently and should be restricted to the car park by installing appropriate signage and vehicular gates. A strict loading/unloading or servicing policy should be developed for tenants' use of vehicles on site. A sign to warn walkers and people using the cottages of the potential risks</del>	GCC /Crown Lands	21%	<b>Divided community opinion on changes to car-parking and access at Dark Corner (26 support, 21 opposed). Opinion was also divided on a lockable entry gate at the boat ramp car park (5 support, 3 opposed).</b>  All proposals were supported in 17 submissions, but other suggestions included 24-hour resident parking (10), limited access for residents (3), no overnight parking (3), no 4WD access (4) and all parking prohibited (1).	Suggest changes in accordance with Strategy Review endorsed by CRP.

	<p><del>should be erected at a logical location on the western edge of the car park where people will be walking past.</del></p> <p><del>Feasibility of a pedestrian path/footbridge around the foreshore should be explored to service cottages, Great North Walk users, fishermen and the general public to access the reserve.</del></p> <p><del>Parking at the cottages should not be allowed from sunset to sunrise.</del></p> <p><b>Vehicle movements associated with the cottages to be conditioned by new tenancy agreements in accordance with the associated identified strategies.</b></p> <p><b>Liability rests with vehicle owner and Crown/Council interests to be safeguarded by tenants insurance policies.</b></p>				
<p><b>6.2.7</b> Cottages have moderate infestation of weeds at the rear of the cottages within the reserve for Public Recreation and Preservation of Native Flora</p>	<p>There are several pockets of cultural plantings associated with the cottages which should be retained where possible. Any exotic/weed species deemed to be a significant threat of further weed infestation should be removed and replaced with appropriate native planting where appropriate. Plants that should be removed include: <i>Tecomaris capensis</i> (Cape Honeysuckle), Lantana, Impatiens and anything else on the GCC Noxious Weeds List (Appendix C).</p>	GCC/Cottage tenants	24%	<p><b>No specific submissions, but generally high level of support for weed management across the plan (47 support, 8 opposed).</b></p>	<p>Suggest no change to action or responsibility</p>
<p><b>6.2.8</b> Cars accessing the cottages are contributing to erosion</p>	<p><del>Consider creating a dedicated parking area for cottage users at the eastern end of the boat ramp car park. This area would be for the benefit of cottage users from sunset to sunrise: that time when vehicles are not permitted at Dark Corner. Car parks should be located in the most convenient location to the cottages. Cars should be prevented from accessing dune areas except in the case of emergencies by installing appropriate signs and upgrading the gate.</del></p>	GCC /Crown Lands	2%	<p><b>Low level of input on controlled access entry and car parking at boat ramp car park (5 support, 3 opposed).</b></p> <p>Upgrades to the existing gate, including locks, opposed. Installation of bollards to prevent access from the boat ramp generally supported.</p>	<p>Suggest deletion of this item in accordance with Strategy Review endorsed by CRP.</p>
<p><b>6.2.9</b> Area not well utilised due to poor</p>	<p><del>From the end of the car park to the boat ramp provide interpretive and directional signage to encourage</del></p>	Crown Lands	23%	<p><b>Significant opposition to additional signage for Dark Corner (39 opposed, 12 support). Significant opposition to signage across the plan area generally (42 opposed, 11 support)</b></p>	<p>Suggest removal of parking signage component of this action from this precinct and added as action <b>(determine where best fits)</b>.</p>

signage	<p><del>greater public use of the area, the Great North Walk and BWNP.</del>  <del>Signage to include details of heritage significance and advising the need for privacy for occupants of cottages.</del>  Review of signage to be referred to trail coordinator. Signage for the Great North Walk to be consistent with that already approved and in use.</p>				Suggest changes to GNW component in accordance with Strategy Review endorsed by CRP.
<b>6.2.10</b> Start of track to Great North Walk is in poor condition	<b>Augment recently installed informative signage at the start of the Great North Walk, Dark Corner by providing additional signage at the eastern end of the boat ramp car park.</b>	Crown Lands	25%	<b>Upgrade to Great North Walk generally supported (33 supports, 23 opposed).</b>  Modest signage and staging would be supported. Opposition felt upgrades were unnecessary or outside the relevant authority for GNW improvements	Is this action required?? Covered by previous action – perhaps could be moved to relevant precinct as it relates to area outside of Dark Corner.

6.3 Precinct B - Patonga Beach

ISSUE	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	PRIORITY (% of submissions)	COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS	COMMENTS
<b>General</b>					
6.3.1 Poorly maintained or failing dune revegetation	Continue dune revegetation works, including fencing and formalising access. Removal of weeds and exotics and replanting with appropriate species. Erect informative signpost advising about the fragility and importance of protecting the dune vegetation. Removal of undesirable items such as garden furniture, dinghies, sailing boats, etc.	GCC	45%	<b>Divided opinion on dune revegetation, generally opposed (61 opposed, 40 support). Further consultation necessary.</b>  High level of opposition for all works (38) and for the installation of fencing and signage on dunes (20). Significant support for weed removal only (7) and for low-height revegetation (5).	
6.3.2 Poor beach access	Formalise beach access and provide signposting. Upgrade entrances. Maintain passages through the revegetation areas using fencing and chain and batten method as required.	GCC	27%	<b>High level of opposition for formalized beach access (44 opposed, 17 support).</b>  <b>High level of opposition to interpretative beach signage (52 opposed, 8 support)</b>  Some support for works that improve access for people with reduced mobility. High level opposition to formal accessways at all (40) and installation of chain and batten entry specifically (4).	
6.3.3 Inconsistent pedestrian access along beach	Provide clear access at the back of the dunes, especially between Brisk Street and the tip of the peninsula at the junction with Patonga Creek. Use board and chain method where sand is exposed.	GCC	31%	<b>High level of opposition to pedestrian access ways (52 opposed, 17 support)</b>  Opposition to formal accessways (43) and installation of chain and batten entry specifically (9).	
6.3.4 Aging Indian Coral trees and Coast Banksias may cause a public risk	Undertake assessment of trees in public areas. Remove trees as required and replace with appropriate species such as Norfolk Island Pines and Coast Banksias.	GCC	51%	<b>Significant opposition to tree management provisions (83 opposed, 32 support)</b>  Majority of objections related to proposed planting of Norfolk Pines (60). General support for removal of hazardous trees.	
6.3.5 Areas of native vegetation	Remove weeds and replace with native species using plant species lists included in GCC's Vegetation	GCC	24%	<b>High level of support for weed management across the plan (47 support, 8 opposed).</b>	

have significant weed infestation	<b>Mapping (Bell, 2009), making reference to appropriate plant communities. Encourage further native revegetation.</b>				
<b>6.3.6</b> Areas of native revegetation in front of houses have been vandalised and removed	<b>Consult with community/landowners on appropriate selection of species as per Appendix B to be planted to maintain views. Reinstate fences until revegetation is established.</b>	GCC	45%	<b>Divided opinion on dune revegetation, generally opposed (61 opposed, 40 support). Further consultation necessary.</b>  High level of opposition for all works (38) and for the installation of fencing and signage on dunes (20). Significant support for weed removal only (7) and for low-height revegetation (5).	
<b>6.3.7</b> Areas of beach, particularly those immediately adjacent to the boat ramp and car park, are suffering from erosion	<b>Car park redesign should set car park back from the beach to allow for a greater area of buffer and provide a gentler slope for revegetation areas to stabilise banks. Construction of a sea wall in this location should be avoided wherever possible (depending upon feedback from specialist consultant advice to the contrary, or where area is limited i.e. in front of cottages).</b>	GCC	21%	<b>Significant support for embankment stabilization (39 support, 9 opposed).</b>  Opposition concerned the ongoing maintenance of works, and requested consultation with boat-ramp users.	
<b>6.3.8</b> Indian Coral Trees are in poor condition and are doing little to ease erosion. Native vegetation has stabilised banks	<b>Indian Coral Trees to the east of the boat ramp should be removed and replaced with <i>Banksia integrifolia</i> or appropriate native species from the plant list contained in GCC's Vegetation Mapping (Bell, 2009). Areas of grass and shrub planting should have protective fencing until plants are established. Indian Coral Trees to the west of the boat ramp should be interplanted with <i>Banksia integrifolia</i>. Indian Coral Trees should be removed when Banksias mature so that a continual provision of shade is provided.</b>	GCC	21%	<b>Significant support for embankment stabilization (39 support, 9 opposed).</b>  General support for all works to address erosion, however a minority of submissions (4) recommended retaining the Indian Coral Trees	
<b>6.3.9</b> Break in the row of Norfolk Island Pines running parallel to residences	<b>Plant Norfolk Island Pines in gaps locating trees in line with side boundaries.</b>	GCC	40%	<b>Very high opposition to Norfolk Pines (78 opposed, 12 support)</b>	

Patonga Boat Ramp				
<b>6.3.10</b> Inefficient use of Patonga boat ramp and car park area	<b>Upgrade and formalise for better manoeuvring.</b> <b>Include associated facilities such as rest areas, shelters, landscaping, lighting, etc. to increase functionality and meet greater demand.</b> <b>Preferred after hours (ie: sunset to sunrise) parking for visitors of Dark Corner and the Great North Walk to eastern end.</b> <b>Attend and repair to rock wall associated with boat ramp.</b>	GCC	53%	<b>Divided opinion on upgrade to boat and car park (64 opposed, 81 support). Redesign of area in consultation with community proposed.</b>  Generally supportive of actions, however additional recommendations on design such as dedicated parking for trailers (7), dual lane ramp (7), changes to car parking, provision of security, changes to waiting areas and the inclusion of a floating pontoon.
<b>6.3.11</b> Poor picnic facilities at Patonga boat ramp	<b>Locate barbecues in the area.</b> <b>Locate new shelters between car park and retaining wall ensuring views of water are not disturbed.</b>	GCC	16%	<b>Divided opinion on BBQ area (15 opposed, 22 support).</b>  Opposition included overall rejection (9) and limitations of available space (4). All 22 supporting submissions supported all works, with particular reference to fish-cleaning facilities.
<b>6.3.12</b> Erosion to embankments	<b>Stabilise eroded embankment. Replace Indian Coral Trees with native species, ensuring views to water are undisturbed (eg: <i>Banksia integrifolia</i>/<i>Cupaniopsis anacardioides</i>).</b>	GCC	21%	<b>Significant support for embankment stabilization (39 support, 9 opposed).</b>  Support generally for all stabilization actions (31), for removal of Coral Trees (5) and for replanting only (2).
<b>6.3.13</b> Need for better connectivity of pedestrian and cycle network.	<b>Provide footpath alongside the road and incorporate into Patonga Circuit in an effort to improve public safety.</b>	GCC	29%	<b>General opposition to pedestrian path (40 opposed, 25 support)</b> Supporting submissions supported either all works (17) or those for improving access for people with reduced mobility (5). Concerns were raised around erosion and intrusion.
Patonga Village Entry				
<b>6.3.14</b> Intersection of Patonga Drive and the Boat ramp not prioritised.	<b>Change road configuration to give clear priority to Patonga Drive.</b>	GCC	11%	<b>Divided opinion on road configuration (12 support, 12 opposed).</b>
<b>6.3.15</b> Upon reaching Patonga	<b>Ensure good visibility of sign by removing obscuring vegetation in front.</b>	GCC	53%	<b>General opposition to additional village entry signage (49 opposed, 32 support). Significant opposition to signage across the plan area generally (42 opposed, 11 support).</b>

village, the sense of arrival could be enhanced. The welcome sign is obscured behind planting	<p><b>Keep signage for bushfire hazard and community notices clearly separate from entry signage.</b></p> <p><b>Remove garbage to a location away from sign.</b></p> <p><b>Extend avenue planting from intersection to the start of the central car park area. Use species with upright form such as <i>Livistona australis</i> (Cabbage Palm) or <i>Cupaniopsis anacardioides</i> (Tuckeroo).</b></p> <p><b>Establish new row of Norfolk Island Pines surrounding the oval along Patonga Drive to enhance the arrival experience to Patonga and connect this space to the rest of the foreshore.</b></p> <p><b>Indian Coral Trees should be removed and replaced with indigenous species on a staged basis.</b></p>			<p>Existing signage generally considered sufficient. Objections raised around subjective nature of issue.</p> <p><b>General opposition to entry avenue planting (26 opposed, 14 support).</b></p> <p><b>Very high levels of opposition to Norfolk Pines (78 opposed, 12 support)</b></p>	
<b>6.3.16</b> Cape Plumbago is blocking views of the water	<b>Remove planting and replace with low growing natives.</b>	GCC	12%	<p><b>General support for establishing views to Brisk Bay (10 opposed, 17 support)</b></p> <p>Concerns raised around need for an environmental assessment and the redundancy of works.</p>	
<b>6.3.17</b> Random layout of picnic area at Patonga village entry with no sense of arrival and poor furniture	<p><b>Redesign picnic area with intention of providing an inviting park to the village entry.</b></p> <p><b>Plant appropriate shade trees from native plant list to replace ageing Indian Coral Trees.</b></p> <p><b>Install new furniture as nominated.</b></p> <p><b>Provide screening to extraneous objects such as Telstra equipment.</b></p>	GCC	19%	<p><b>Divided opinion on upgraded picnic area (38 opposed, 38 support)</b></p> <p>Objecting submissions related to a general opposition (17), generic street furniture (7) and no screening or fencing (7).</p>	
<b>6.3.18</b> Seating at Patonga village entry	<p><b>Create additional sitting area at eastern end to the car park with seating orientated towards the view.</b></p> <p><b>Place bushfire hazard and community notices, ensuring views to the water are not blocked and there is no interference with a strong and clear entry to the village.</b></p>	GCC	12%	<p><b>Divided opinion on sitting area (14 opposed, 13 support)</b></p> <p>Generally considered unnecessary for public amenity.</p>	
<b>6.3.19</b> Weed	<b>Better consultation with the community on species selection. Letterbox</b>	GCC	24%	<b>Significant support for maintenance of bush reserve (9 opposed, 44 support)</b>	

infestation has occurred in areas of foreshore affronting homes. Gardens planted on reserve with inappropriate species selection	<b>drop residents with appropriate species. Remove exotic species/gardens from any area of Crown Land along the Patonga Beach.</b>			Opposing submissions recommended that bushland area be converted to car parking (6) or to picnic facilities (3). Most submissions supported bushland regeneration in this area, in collaboration with the Bushcare group.	
<b>6.3.20</b> Poor appearance of stormwater channel and interference with the pedestrian link	<b>Remove weeds and line channel with rocks. Replant using indigenous species. Improve overall appearance of channel and make feature of village entry. Small boardwalk to be built over stormwater outlet access zones. The boardwalk should be a minimal intervention, lightweight in construction and appearance using natural materials e.g. timber.</b>	GCC	16%	<b>High level of support for upgrade of stormwater channel (34 support, 2 opposed)</b>  Generally a low priority unless intervention necessary. Boardwalk would likely be opposed due to incompatibility with Patonga amenities unless design principles observed.	
<b>6.3.21</b> Unattractive visual amenity of pump station	<b>Screen planting to building to improve sense of arrival using native species (Appendix B).</b>	GCC	12%	<b>General support for screen planting to pump station (10 opposed, 16 support)</b>  Primarily aesthetic objections to screen planting.	
<b>Patonga Village Central</b>					
<b>6.3.22</b> Poor visual amenity of car park and promenade at heart of village, dominance of traffic	<b>Reconfiguration of car park with 45° angle parking. Landscaped median required to address appearance of car park and break up expanse of road. Tree planting of <i>Cupaniopsis anacardioides</i> (Tuckeroo) . Widen promenade between car park and beach with provision of seating and lighting.</b>		53%	<b>High level of opposition to car-park and promenade upgrade (110 opposed, 9 support).</b>  Wide ranging design, safety and amenity issues associated with proposed design. Issues with parking and road access major objections. Other issues relating to storm surges (10), planting in median strip (4), access for commercial fishers (3), and need for further research and redesign (12) featured prominently. Converting area to a shared zone (3), including disabled parking (6) were raised in support of proposal.	
<b>6.3.23</b> Poor link	<b>Formalise pedestrian crossing to strengthen link.</b>	GCC	24%	<b>Divided opinion on pedestrian crossing (23 opposed, 32 support)</b>	

between shops and beach				Both supporting and opposing submissions raised issues of safety. The selection of location, the reduction in parking space and the general need for better design of area were raised as objections.	
<b>6.3.24</b> Lack of focus point at heart of Patonga village	<b>Construct a new unique shelter on the axis of the crossing to become new focus point and iconic element to promote Patonga.</b>	GCC	25\$	<b>High level of opposition to shelter/landmark (47 opposed, 9 support)</b>  Generally regarded as an unnecessary use of resources.	
<b>6.3.25</b> Playground at Patonga village central is underutilised	<b>Upgrade playground to similar standard as the one next to PCCA. Provide additional picnic facilities. Plant shade trees such as <i>Ficus rubiginosa</i> (Rusty Fig) or <i>Ficus henniana</i> (Strangler Fig).</b>	GCC	19%	<b>Significant support for playground upgrade (12 opposed, 31 support)</b>  Significant support, although some opposing submissions against shade trees (2), fencing (1) and the current location (2). Improving maintenance of site frequent request in supporting and opposing submissions.	
<b>6.3.26</b> Patonga wharf needs upgrading	<b>Upgrade wharf with appropriate handrails and lighting, seating as nominated in Appendix A. Consideration should be given to concessions at peak times (e.g. coffee concession) to encourage visitors.</b>	GCC	38%	<b>Significant opposition to upgrades to public wharf (59 opposed, 26 support)</b>  Support ranged from all proposals (12) through to support for improved maintenance and cleaning only (8). High level of opposition to concessions (30) and to the proposed upgrades including generic furniture section (27).	
<b>6.3.27</b> Undefined areas for bathers and other users	<b>Turf areas between promenade and beach to allow for casual seating and picnic. Dinghy storage allowed in orderly manner providing public use is not compromised. Central beach section to front of car park to be signposted exclusively for bathers. Signs to direct concessional users to either side of central beach area (suitable activities include: windsurfing, snorkelling, sea kayaking, surf school, water-based tours of the bay and Patonga Creek).</b>	GCC	60%	<b>High opposition to turf area (26 opposed, 3 support)</b>  <b>Significant opposition to bathing area (26 opposed, 11 support)</b>  <b>Very high level of opposition to commercial concessions (62 opposed, 7 support)</b>  Majority of concerns with turf area related to the unsustainability of the proposals given storm surges. Both the proposal for bathing area and water-based concessions rejected for safety issues and incompatibility with local character.	

6.4 Precinct C: Patonga Caravan and Camping Area

ISSUE	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	PRIORITY (% of submissions)	COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS	COMMENTS
6.4.1 Access to the public foreshore is often inhibited by camp ground users and creek residents	<b>Camp sites and car parking should be moved back from the public foreshore and open space strengthened along this zone as per the PCCA PoM and Masterplan.</b>	GCC	37%	<b>Very high level of opposition to proposed parking arrangements for creek residents (82 opposed, 1 support)</b>	
6.4.2 Parking issues on PCCA site with visitor parking	<b>Provide secure gated entry to separate car parking for PCCA users and playground visitors and residents. Need for onsite manager (see below). Upgrade existing internal car park with adequate landscape buffer to adjoining residence.</b>	GCC	31%	<b>High levels of opposition to gated vehicle entry (57 opposed, 12 support).</b>  Concerns raised about reducing local access and day-visitor access to public land, including boat ramp. Supporting submissions emphasized the need for creek resident access and to limit overall visitors to the PCCA site.  <b>Significant opposition to upgrades of internal car park (24 opposed, 8 support).</b>  Concerns raised about impact on adjoining residents, and the provision of additional parking to facilitate PCCA expansion. Supportive submissions favoured measures for self-contained parking on PCCA site.	
6.4.3 Need for onsite manager	<b>Construct new control point with office, shop and night manager's facility.</b>	GCC	16%	<b>Significant opposition to new amenities (29 opposed, 7 support).</b>  Current amenities considered adequate with recent upgrades. Minor support for a kiosk or works to improve overall site security.	
6.4.4 Car parking across the site is unstructured and overflowing onto foreshore areas	<b>As above. Car parking should be in a designated area set back from the foreshore zone as per the PCCA PoM and Masterplan. Relocate the tennis courts to an area within the EWMO to provide for parking needs for the PCCA. Construct car park to cater for overflow parking.</b>	GCC	76%	<b>Very high opposition to provision of car park in this area (168 opposed, 3 support)</b>  <b>Very high opposition to relocation of tennis courts (152 opposed, 3 support)</b>	

<p><b>6.4.5</b> Waste management needs to be addressed as rubbish is often left abandoned in public reserve areas</p>	<p><b>A designated waste storage zone closer to the entry of the PCCA should be created. Creek residents should also be able to use this facility. Location as per the PCCA PoM and Masterplan.</b></p>	GCC	11%	<p><b>Very high opposition to relocation/new establishment of waste storage area (24 opposed, 1 support).</b></p> <p>Proposed waste storage site considered inappropriate for creek residents access, and to have hygiene, health and amenity issues for nearby residences.</p>	
<p><b>6.4.6</b> Ageing Banksias propose risk to playground and picnic area users</p>	<p><b>Undertake risk assessment. Undertake remedial works and arrange for replacement planting in accordance with GCC's Vegetation Mapping (Bell, 2009, Unit E33b; Umina Sands Coastal Woodland). <u>Note:</u> This is a designated EEC and may require licences from DECCW.</b></p>	GCC	20%	<p><b>Significant support for management of aging banksias (11 opposed, 33 support).</b></p> <p>Most opposing submissions requested banksias be maintained unless proven hazardous.</p>	
<p><b>6.4.7</b> Inefficient road network and poor site drainage</p>	<p><b>Reconfiguration of road layout and reconfiguration of campsites. Improve site drainage.</b></p>	GCC	14%	<p><b>Divided opinion on reconfiguration of campsites (19 opposed, 13 support).</b></p> <p>Concerns were raised over increases to the number of camping sites, increasing erosion issues, congestion, and overall site design. Supporting submissions indicated the need for improved drainage, and reconfigurations to reduce overall number of sites.</p>	
<p><b>6.4.8</b> There are issues of safety at night</p> <p>Stormwater run-off and drainage and how this overflows into the waterways</p> <p>Erosion control measures already undertaken do little to soften the natural feel of this area</p>	<p><b>Refer PCCA PoM and Masterplan.</b></p>	GCC	52%	<p><b>Large number of objections to overall PCCA masterplan (114 opposed, 3 support).</b></p> <p>Very high level of opposition to privatisation of PCCA (73) and expansion of PCCA (69). Specific objections to issues of regulatory compliance, including fire safety, wastewater treatment, and general amenities provision. Supporting submissions on PCCA masterplan stressed modest improvements for the financial viability of the site.</p>	

6.5 Precinct D: Patonga Creek

ISSUE	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	PRIORITY (% of submissions)	COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS	COMMENTS
<p><b>6.5.1</b> Boats are parked all over the foreshore</p>	<p><b>Create designated dinghy anchor points in convenient locations away from boat ramp and away from points where people may wish to gain access to the creek.</b> <b>Consider licence fees to cover costs of providing anchor points and policing.</b></p>	GCC	69%	<p><b>High level of opposition to proposed dinghy storage and rationalization (138 opposed, 17 support)</b></p> <p>A high number of submissions (82) rejected proposed racks or anchor points. In addition, a significant number of submissions (55) opposed licence fees. 15 submissions emphasized the need for some rationalization of dinghies on foreshore, although did not necessarily support plan proposals.</p>	
<p><b>6.5.2</b> Fishing nets and oyster growing equipment is left scattered along the foreshore</p>	<p><b>Negotiation with local fishers required as to the extent of the fishing related activities and the areas occupied by them, to minimise conflict with other users.</b> <b>Fishing related activities should not be discouraged and are wanted, but the responsibility of sharing public space should be made clear in consultation with fishers.</b></p>	GCC	24%	<p><b>High level of opposition to interference with current fishing activity (45 opposed, 8 support)</b></p> <p>All objections expressed need for fishers to maintain current activities. Containment with no commercial impact was proposed by most supporting submissions.</p>	
<p><b>6.5.3</b> Some residents adjoining the reserve have used the space as an extension of their private gardens. Furniture and play equipment permanently left in the area clutters up the space and reduces the natural feel</p>	<p><b>Residents are encouraged to make use of the foreshore area as much as possible; however furniture, trampolines etc should be removed after use and should not permanently remain in public areas and items should be relocated back onto private property.</b> <b>Letterbox drop should be undertaken to make this known to residents.</b></p>	GCC / Local residents	46%	<p><b>Divided opinion on opening up private land on creek foreshore (53 opposed, 51 support).</b></p> <p>Generally, submissions reflected that current access was sufficient, and that proposed changes were unnecessary for public access, amenity or enjoyment. Supporting submissions stressed the need for resident collaboration (12), supporting works for improved mobility (5), and to minimize intrusion for current residents.</p>	
<p><b>6.5.4</b> Gardens built</p>	<p><b>Significant gardens of exotic plants should be thinned out and generally interpreted as a public space.</b></p>	GCC / Local residents	46%	<p><b>Significant opposition to creation of a designated walking trail (74 opposed, 27 support).</b></p>	

with dense planting along the foreshore cuts access and privatises the public space	<p><b>Provide a designated walking trail within public space to allow people to move more freely within the reserve.</b></p> <p><b>Residents should be made aware of these changes well in advance to allow them time to try and make changes themselves.</b></p> <p><b>Letterbox drop should be undertaken or doorknocking in circumstances where considerable thinning out needs to occur.</b></p> <p><b>Still encourage residents care of the space, but provide guidelines on how it is looked after.</b></p>			<p><b>Divided opinion on opening up private land on creek foreshore (53 opposed, 51 support).</b></p> <p>Generally, submissions reflected that current access was sufficient, and that proposed changes were unnecessary for public access, amenity or enjoyment. Supporting submissions stressed the need for resident collaboration (12), supporting works for improved mobility (5), and to minimize intrusion for current residents.</p>	
<p><b>6.5.5</b> Some exotic species have spread throughout the area as weeds. A bad infestation of bamboo has spread at the entrance to the National Park, immediately adjoining endangered salt marsh</p>	<p><b>Bamboo should be removed and replaced with appropriate native species. Ensure removal of stump and roots to prevent regrowth. Routinely check for regrowth and treat as soon as convenient.</b></p> <p><b>Letterbox drop nearby residents to educate them on the fragility of the nearby ecosystem and suggest efforts that they can undertake to minimise weed outbreak. Do this as the need requires, say every 5 years (minimum).</b></p>	GCC	-	<p><b>No specific submissions on this topic.</b></p> <p>Generally, management of weeds and exotics was supported in submissions.</p>	
<p><b>6.5.6</b> Car park at Patonga Wetland is underutilised and area is generally in a poor condition</p>	<p><b>Remove weeds and replace with appropriate native species. Replace broken/vandalised bollards/signage etc.</b></p> <p><b>Improve lighting in the area.</b></p>	GCC	30%	<p><b>General opposition to proposed works for the Patonga Wetlands (40 opposed, 27 support)</b></p> <p>Concerns raised with increased foot traffic and parking in the Wetlands area, and issues associated with increased public access to vulnerable natural environment.</p>	
<p><b>6.5.7</b> Waste (particularly green waste) has been</p>	<p><b>Improve the provision of green waste removal in Patonga, preventing residents from dumping waste.</b></p> <p><b>Better education of the likely outcomes from dumping green waste in sensitive areas (the whole of</b></p>	GCC	-	<p><b>No specific submissions on this topic.</b></p>	

dumped throughout the reserve stimulating weed growth	<b>Patonga).</b>				
<b>6.5.8</b> There are no designated rest stops/seats along the foreshore	<b>Locate nominated seats and picnic facilities as per the PoM.</b>	GCC	16%	<b>Divided opinion on the provision of occasional rest stops (16 opposed, 19 support).</b>  Opposition to use of generic street furniture (8), to the intrusion on existing landscape (7) were main issues.	
<b>6.5.9</b> Picnic facilities and walking track at the Patonga Creek Wetland end of the foreshore are in poor condition	<b>Update furniture to match Patonga. Provide barbecue. Improve walking track, including boardwalks where warranted. Erect interpretive signage. Upgrade car park area. Initiate funds additional to money from fishing licences for the works of upgrading the car park area.</b>	GCC	45%	<b>Significant opposition to creation of a designated walking trail (aka "Patonga Circuit") (74 opposed, 27 support).</b>  <b>High level of opposition to additional car-parking in this area (51 opposed, 7 support)</b>  Signage, formalisation, additional parking and insufficient information about design were raised as issues in opposing submissions. A significant number of supportive submissions supported works to improve access for people with limited mobility (7). The significant opposition to signage across the plan area generally would apply here also (42 opposed, 11 support).	
<b>6.5.10</b> Poorly defined walking trails and burden of high demand car parks by reserve users	<b>Establish circuit for Patonga (ie: The Patonga Circuit). Provide directional and informative signage where required. This should include Aboriginal and European heritage. Provide additional car parking at various locations to encourage different start and finish points for the circuit, which will relieve the demand on the more obvious car parks. Clear directional signage necessary to lead people to alternative car park locations.</b>	GCC	45%	<b>Significant opposition to creation of a designated walking trail (aka "Patonga Circuit") (74 opposed, 27 support).</b>  <b>High level of opposition to additional car-parking in this area (51 opposed, 7 support)</b>  Signage, formalisation, additional parking and insufficient information about design were raised as issues in opposing submissions. A significant number of supportive submissions supported works to improve access for people with limited mobility (7). The significant opposition to signage across the plan area generally would apply here also (42 opposed, 11 support).	

6.6 Precinct E: Eve Williams Memorial Oval

ISSUE	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	PRIORITY (% of submissions)	COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS	COMMENTS
<p><b>6.6.1</b> The oval is not level and its boundary is poorly delineated. There is potential to enhance the landscaped nature of this open space</p>	<p><b>Plant shade trees e.g. <i>Ficus rubiginosa</i> (Rusty Fig) along the Patonga Drive boundary to improve the delineation of the oval.</b> <b>Rehabilitate the oval – install drainage, irrigation, spear point, new turf, new cricket wicket and floodlighting.</b></p>	GCC	38%	<p><b>General opposition to oval upgrades (58 opposed, 28 support).</b>  Majority of objections were to additional lighting (35) and to all proposed works (14). Some support for improved drainage and storm-water management (9).</p>	
<p><b>6.6.2</b> Scattered plantings of Indian Coral Trees along the edge of the oval provide little sense of arrival to Patonga and poorly delineate the boundary to the oval</p>	<p><b>Native trees should be planted in this zone as per above. Indian Coral Trees should be progressively removed once the native trees are mature enough to provide shade.</b></p>	GCC	12%	<p><b>Divided opinion on new tree planting (11 opposed, 16 support).</b>  Opposition to tree plantings were considered unnecessary (8), to impede access and visual amenity, or to involve maintenance issues (2).</p>	
<p><b>6.6.3</b> Boules court is in poor condition and is underutilised</p>	<p><b>Area could be better used for car parking for the oval and if tennis courts are relocated to this area.</b></p>	GCC	20%	<p><b>Very high opposition to relocation of boules court (45 opposed, 1 support).</b></p>	
<p><b>6.6.4</b> Interface between the adjoining residents is poor</p>	<p><b>Grassed areas within GCC/DPI boundary should be better maintained.</b></p>	GCC	-	<p><b>No specific submissions on this action.</b>  All proposed oval works were rejected in 14 submissions, which may include changes to boundary management.</p>	

6.6.5 Relocating of tennis courts	Construct new tennis courts and associated facilities to replace courts at PCCA.	GCC	69%	Very high opposition to relocation of tennis courts (152 opposed, 3 support)	
6.6.6 Need for extended car park with new uses at oval	Construct new car park at Bay Street with screen planting to ensure privacy to adjoining residences.	GCC	39%	Very high opposition to construction of car park in this area (87 opposed, 1 support)	
6.6.7 Weed infestation along creekline	Remove weeds and exotics such as Indian Coral Trees from the edge of the oval and within the creekline.	GCC	24%	Significant support for improving creekline management (13 opposed, 40 support)  Issues raised with retaining Coral Trees (4), retaining mulberry trees (2) and need for high level of co-ordination with bushcare groups and residents. Supporting submissions expressed preference for weed/exotic removal without revegetation.	
6.6.8 Inconsistent and lack of directional signage	Directional signage to show where all key features of Patonga are located. Install new informative signage. Signage to be consistent with other tourist related sites to unify individual elements.	GCC	17%	Significant opposition to additional directional signage and theming (31 opposed, 7 support)  Consistent with general opposition to additional signage in the Patonga area. Supporting submissions generally preferred minimal and low-key signage.	
6.6.9 Improved management of the reserve	GCC should seek appointment as trustee under Sect 95 of the CLA to facilitate the adoption and implementation of the PoM.	GCC	9%	High level of opposition to appointment of GCC as trustee (19 opposed, 1 support)  Concerns raised about continuing community input, and lack of information about proposed management arrangements.	

6.7 **Precinct F: Patonga Progress Hall and Volunteer Bush Fire Brigade Delete Precinct from plan**

ISSUE	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	PRIORITY (% of submissions)	COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS	COMMENTS
6.7.1 Bush Fire Brigade building is relatively new and there are no noted issues with this building	<del>Provide tree planting to improve the overall appearance of the street.</del>	PVBB	-	<del>No specific submissions on this action.</del>  Low number of submissions (7) supported provision of shade trees in this area.	Delete from plan
6.7.2 Patonga Progress Hall	<del>Upgrade building to cater for community needs and disabled access. Possible future uses include: community theatre, child care, playground, seniors' tea room, men's shed, group tourist accommodation, adult education, visiting medical officers, subject to permissible uses noted in the LEP.</del>	GCC	36%	<del>High level of opposition to Hall upgrade (68 opposed, 12 support).</del>  20% of the opposing submissions rejected the proposed future uses as inappropriate and unnecessary.	Delete from plan
6.7.3 There is a large area of land behind the hall that is relatively unused	<del>Evaluate the viability to create a community garden, possible pre-school area and playground and greening/recycling reverse garbage centre. With a community garden the fruit and vegetables could be sold to the local residents/visitors and funds generated could be put towards Patonga Progress Association's endeavours.</del>	GCC/Patonga Progress Association	19%	<del>Significant opposition to development of external spaces and landscaping (31 opposed, 12 support)</del>  Opposing submissions argued that current use was adequate, and additional works would be redundant, unnecessary or inappropriate for the site. Supporting submissions suggested playground (2), recycling/reverse garbage facility (4) or community garden (1).	Delete from plan
6.7.4 Car parking with poor visual amenity and no provision of shade	<del>Formalise and resurface car park with proper kerb and guttering. Planting of shade trees.</del>	GCC	25%	<del>Significant opposition to formalized car parking (40 opposed, 16 support).</del>  Opposing submissions rejected proposed works as inconsistent with character of community infrastructure. High level of opposition to kerb and guttering. Approximately half (7) of the supporting submissions supported shade trees only, and opposed kerb & guttering.	Delete from plan