



## Meeting Minutes

### Patonga Crown Reserves and Dark Corner Cottages Plan of Management Community Reference Panel (CRP) Meeting 4

Thursday, 21 November 2013  
9.30 am – 12.00 pm  
Erina Trust Hall

#### Present:

CRP Member	Initials	Representing
Stewart Veitch	SV	Crown Lands
Rob Micheli	RM	Crown Lands
Stephen Fairnham	SF	Gosford City Council
Kim Radford	KR	Gosford City Council
Katherine Bridekirk	KB	Gosford City Council (Minutes)
Andrew Minto	AM	Patonga Beach Progress Association
Philip Doughty	PD	Patonga Beach Progress Association
Dain Simpson	DS	Patonga Community
Mark Zwan	MZ	Patonga Community

#### Apologies:

Colleen Worthy-Jennings.

SV welcomed everyone, and thanked Stephen Fairnham for attending in Colleen Worthy-Jennings's place.

SV tabled an email from members of the Patonga tennis club regarding the tennis courts at Patonga which expressed their views. SV identified concern regarding the wording of the email and that the document was not the type to be put before the CRP

#### 1. Matters Arising from the Minutes

- a) Amend Action Table item 3.2 to read as follows: "Removal of the wording 'Permissive Occupancy tenants' and change to 'existing occupants' – from Final Management Strategy Table A – Mg Strategy 5.5.1" – now complete.
- b) CRP to review Precinct C – Patonga Caravan and Camping Area and bring their requested change of wording/suggested additions to Management Strategies and Actions to the next meeting – deferred.

- c) Community reps to provide alternate options/resolutions following community meeting where they are not satisfied with the plan's content with regards to Precinct C – deferred.

SV clarified comments he made in Meeting 3 Minutes – General Business Item 2a. In the third last paragraph, remove the wording "...issued a letter to..." and replace with "...supported...".

## 2. General Business

### a) CRP review of Precinct B – Patonga Beach Management Strategies and Actions

Prior to commencing the review of the tables, DS advised there are repetitive issues that he would like to table before the review of each action to save time. He provided a handout addressing the following issues which were discussed by the CRP:

- i) *Delete Norfolk Island Pines – no additional planting of Norfolk Island Pines or use as a cultural planting.*

DS advised that it was evident through all submissions received that no additional Norfolk pines should be planted. KR advised that this had been pushed by the consultant that prepared the POM and GCC and Crown Lands had previously suggested that it be removed and replaced by a more suitable native species such as Tuckeroo. Delete by consensus.

- ii) *Road and car park design – there needs to be included in the draft plan a strategy and associated action to address all the issues raised in regard to traffic parking and pedestrian movements in Precinct B.*

DS advised there is a road and traffic problem. KR said a design had been done previously for the boat ramp, seawall and car park, but it hadn't been acted on, is now 18 years old and now obsolete.

DS said there was a need to maximise car spaces and that the right hand turn out of Patonga Drive was dangerous. He advised of the need for traffic calming in front of the hotel due to traffic/pedestrian conflict, although the proposal for a pedestrian crossing is unrealistic, as it would remove parking spaces. Need a design based around safety and benefit of parking and pedestrian movement. DS noted that a divider would cause serious issues for commercial fishermen and claimed Council Officers considered 45 degree parking inappropriate. DS advised two speed bumps had been proposed by Council but he had not received a response to a recent query. DS suggested a proper road and traffic study be undertaken. SV and KR agreed to amalgamate into one study. RM asked whether reference to parking should be removed from the plan referring to the need for the study prior to decisions being made for reserve areas.

KR advised Patonga Boat Ramp is a Council managed reserve and not a road reserve. KR advised that the development of a plan could occur with community consultation. KR said a pedestrian crossing would not be approved, as there was not enough traffic to warrant this. AM suggested doing a traffic assessment before the plan is adopted. SV advised the Plan of Management should not be deferred while studies are undertaken and agrees that clear objectives need to be identified in the plan.

CRP agreed that such a study needed to look at providing boat and parking facilities; ensure safety for road users and pedestrians with appropriate intersections and signage; and also to look at how parking will be managed.

DS will email KR with his notes and Council's traffic section would work with the community to develop key objectives for traffic study. PD asked if seating would be incorporated with landscaping, and would both be in the traffic study. KR advised no, they would be separate.

- iii) *Delete reference to chain and batten walkways – on the dunes and at the other points around the foreshore.* DS advised natural pathways were preferred. All in agreement. PD advised that the community accepts woodchips as an alternative – all CRP in agreement.
- iv) *Delete the use of fencing for dune restoration – the community generally oppose dune revegetation, there is no historic evidence to support revegetation and particularly oppose the use of fencing.* DS advised some fencing was vandalised the day it was installed. AM advised the fencing created a trip hazard. MZ advised there was no vegetation there to begin with.

RM commented that dune fencing is a management tool to avoid trampling of vegetation and to trap sand and keep it there. It protects assets from storm surges, erosion and ultimately sea level rise. He also noted that the sand peninsula leading towards Patonga Creek could be a very dynamic landform and questioned whether works were vandalised due to ulterior motives such as maintaining water views from certain vantages.

SV advised people's assets are being exposed and through changes to the Coastal Protection Act residents may seek to utilise the provision to utilise sand bags if sufficient stabilisation was not catered for.

PD advised that according to the study by Patterson & Britton (Broken Bay), no revegetation was necessary and the community is happy to leave revegetation to natural succession as they had voted in 2009 not to have revegetation work undertaken. Also that the Dunecare group was small and unable to effectively manage a large sized area.

KR advised that work was done by Bushcare Officers in 2007, with a grant for dune revegetation works, which became quite controversial at the time. Officially, Bushcare doesn't look after the dune area. KR said that although the rationale behind the fence was to address windblown sand drift hazards, her preference was to remove the fencing, as Council can't maintain it and doesn't have the resources for ongoing revegetation works. KR advised that there were issues however with individuals taking control of the foreshore.

SV advised he was not necessarily comfortable with that and would like to see some sort of Dunecare committee established with community representation. KR advised that Dunecare should be replaced by Bushcare as it broadened opportunities. The Community Environment Network (CEN) previously liaised with Council. Council could work with other agencies, service providers and the community on vegetation management issues. PD advised it's a strong issue. SV advised he does not want it to be too prescriptive in the plan, the objective should relate to consultation.

PD asked KR about residents who extend their lawns 3 metres past their boundary line – he sees that area as important, and wanted to know if KR suggested removal of those 3 metres – KR advised no. PD advised he sees those areas as part of pedestrian access. MZ asked for clarification on dune care, in terms of getting groups together, for example, who will outline what can and can't be planted. AM said objectives would need to be set, and implemented only as resources become available.

## **Review of Community Submissions Management Strategy Table.**

See revised Table - Community Submissions Management Strategy Tables V4 5-12-2013.

### **b) General Questions or additional items – around the table**

PD circulated the following points for discussion regarding Precinct C Patonga Caravan and Camping Area:

*This precinct is scheduled for discussion at the next CRP meeting. Prior to this meeting the Community representatives recommend to the panel:*

- i) That the Gosford City Council members of the CRP and two Community representatives of the CRP meet to discuss Precinct C and prepare recommendations and suggestions for consideration at CRP meeting scheduled for 12<sup>th</sup> December 2013.*
- ii) That the plan of survey submitted to the October meeting of the CRP be applied as an overlay to Council's 2007 Trehy survey plan to provide the base for discussion to recommend a 'best fit' boundary between allotments 7004 and 7006.*
- iii) That 'mud maps' be prepared for allotments 7004 and 7006 including the recommendations and suggestions decided upon from the meeting set out in i) above.*
- iv) The community has the overlaid plan and the 'mud map' for allotment 7004 prepared for submission.*

With regards to item (i) SV advised that any discussion should be with Crown lands also as owners of the land, however after discussion with RM and due to the short time period that this may not be practical for Crown Lands to also meet so he agreed to item (i).

SV advised the Trehy survey is not a land survey. SV recognised that Mepstead & Associates would need to correlate the two based on the same Azimuth.

PD advised he wants to overlay one plan over another. AM advised pegged information is required to move forward. SV advised when i) is completed, if a further survey is required, he is happy to discuss then. KR requested that once the pegs are in the ground, she would like a diagrammatic representation of the area for planning purposes. SV advised he already has that. He will provide this to KR, she could then put get measurements through CAD or similar. SV advised he will ask staff surveyors to provide this to KR. SV advised if the surveyor has GPS points, KR has the ability to do this.

SV advised he will produce the plan. AM said the issue is what the starting point is. Some vigorous discussion took place between all CRP members regarding the issue of how the survey instruction was issued. PD raised the point that no discussion was held in the CRP meeting which indicated that the survey instruction would not be issued other than from the survey tabled at the CRP. SV responded that the right questions were not asked. SV advised to get a line on the ground and then agree on a consensus approach about any issues that arise from this delineation.

### **3. Close**

The meeting was closed at 12.20 pm.

The next meeting will be held in the Patonga Community Hall on Thursday, 12 December 2013 between 1:30–4:00pm.

Post Meeting Comment: Suggest discussion of Precinct D and E next meeting to allow more time for community to consider Precinct C. Next Agenda to include CRP review of Precinct D - Patonga Creek and Precinct E – Eve Williams Memorial Oval Management Strategies.

If time permits, suggest walking over Precinct C to get a feel for the issues on the ground in relation to the boundary delineation.

## Action Table

Meeting & action number	Item number (from Minutes)	Issue	Responsibility	Completion Target	Completion Date
3.5	1. b) (Meeting 3)	CRP to review Precinct C – Patonga Caravan and Camping Area and bring their requested change of wording/suggested additions to Management Strategies to the next meeting.	All CRP	16/1/14	
3.7	2. b) 3. c) (Meeting 3)	Community reps to provide alternate options/resolutions following community meeting where they are not satisfied with the plan's content with regards to Precinct C – as per SV email dated 30 October 2013 (see Annexure 1).	AM DS MZ PD	16/1/14	
4.1	2. a)	Crown Lands to revise Management Strategy Tables for Precinct B, and email to CRP.	SV RM	28/11/13	5/12/13
4.2		Crown Lands to revise Management Action Tables for Precinct B	SV RM	The Action Tables will be updated upon completion of the review of all precinct management strategies given overlap between precincts.	
4.3		Council/Crown Lands to circulate Minutes for CRP review.	KB RM	28/11/13	5/12/13
4.4		CRP to provide RM with any changes to Minutes or Precinct B Management Strategy Tables.	All CRP	10/12/13	9/12/13
4.5		Council to load Minutes onto Council website.	Council	11/12/13	
4.6		CRP to review Precinct D & E and bring their requested change of wording/suggested additions to Management Strategies to the next meeting.	All CRP	12/12/13	
4.7		Any new agenda items to RM.	CRP	10/12/13	None provided.