

**Port Botany Expansion  
Community Consultative Committee**

**Date:** February 22, 2007

**Meeting number:** 4

**Attendees:**

Neil Brener (NB) – Business Representative  
 John Burgess (JB) – Community Representative  
 Nancy Hillier (NH) – Community Representative  
 Neil Melvin (NM) – Community Representative  
 Paul Pickering (PP) – Community Representative  
 Paul Shepherd (PS) – City of Botany Bay Council  
 Robyn Eisermann (RE) – Randwick City Council  
 Roberta Ryan – Chairperson  
 Sandra Spate – Minutes taker  
 Colin Rudd (CR) – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Kamini Parashar (KP) – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Marika Calfas (MC) – Sydney Ports Corporation

**Apologies:**

**Not present:** Patrick Williams

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
1	<b>Minutes of last meeting</b> – discussion led by Chair			
1.1	<p>A process was proposed for dealing with procedural matters raised by JB/PP in response to minutes of the last meeting.</p> <p>Matters raised by JB will be attached to tonight's minutes.</p> <p>Issues raised by community members between meetings – a summary of these will be presented to CCC meetings and attached to minutes (de-identified) for distribution. A summary of issues raised by the community between November 2006 and February 2007 was distributed at the meeting.</p> <p>KP requested that issues raised with CCC members be forwarded to her so they could be consolidated for presentation to the CCC</p>	<p>Chair will circulate matters raised by members of the CCC and the community prior to meetings.</p> <p>Chair to circulate agenda items requested by CCC members prior to meetings.</p> <p>Issues raised by the community to be provided to the CCC in summary form.</p>	<p>Chair</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>SPC</p>	
1.2	A letter from a community member was distributed. The letter raised concerns over insufficient parking, shortening of the length of the beach, water quality at storm-water drain, the possible			

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
	<p>introduction of no parking on Foreshore Rd and the perceived lack of response from SPC.</p> <p>KP responded that the location and size of the boat ramp was decided in consultation with the community during the EIS. SPC has noted feedback from fishing groups and the community on the proposed designs. The proposed parking is deemed to be sufficient for everyday demands. SPC's research has shown that it complies with and exceeds current guidelines in NSW regarding parking at boat-ramps. SPC is continuing to look at providing additional parking for beach users in the vicinity of the Millstream lookout.</p> <p>JB suggested that while parking for the boat ramp in itself may be sufficient, it becomes insufficient due its location near the beach and other public facilities, particularly with restrictions to parking in Foreshore Rd, thereby denying public access to their beach. Conflict may arise between the public and boat users. He suggested that Botany Council could reopen their car-park in Sir Joseph Banks Park, noting that sections were in poor state and suggesting there was sufficient space for parking as well as current usage. He also suggested that airport land may be an option.</p> <p>NH registered her disagreement with the suggestion to reopen the Council car-park.</p> <p>PS accepts that relocation of boat ramp and the creation of acceleration lanes on Foreshore Rd will create competition for parking spaces. Any decision about parking restrictions on Foreshore Rd is the responsibility of the RTA. He reported it is Council's intention to maintain the former car-park for its current use (for green waste recycling).</p>			
1.3	KP reported that on the issue of			

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
	<p>compensation for loss of fishing area as demanded by fishing groups – discussions have been held with NSW Department of Primary Industries (Fisheries) who are now dealing with the matter.</p> <p>JB suggests compensation should be provided for loss of the bay area for fishing as recreational fisherman bought out commercial interests in Botany Bay. If this had not happened commercial fishermen would expect to be compensated.</p> <p>CR reported that Fisheries would be responding directly to these issues.</p>			
2	<p><b>Actions arising:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Placement of items on Council website - SPC</b></li> <li>• <b>Boat washing – items in EIS and general discussion – SPC and all</b></li> <li>• <b>Trains noise at Banksia Street – SPC</b></li> <li>• <b>Discussions with SACL regarding access – SPC</b></li> <li>• <b>Interference with radio waves – discussion if required on information provided by SPC</b></li> </ul>			
2.1	<p><b>Placement of items on Council website</b></p> <p>Randwick Council has established a website link and Botany Council has agreed to do the same.</p>			
2.2	<p><b>Boat engine washing</b></p> <p>CR reported that if recycled stormwater could be used and once used drained to the Bay, this facility will be included in the design of the ramp..</p>			
2.3	<p><b>Trains noise at Banksia St</b></p> <p>CR confirmed that noise was being created by trains stopping at the level crossing and reported that some of this noise (trains hooting) would be alleviated by the Banksia Rd pedestrian bridge. SPC would work with RailCorp to investigate ways of relocating signaling to avoid trains stopping in the area, this will require time to consider options.</p>			

<b>Item</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>By whom</b>	<b>When</b>
2.4	<p><b>Discussions with SACL</b> CR reported that SACL had indicated fencing would remain in the short term to allow the re-vegetation of the area to establish. Safety issues may also arise if fencing was removed. JB requested an assurance that in the long term this area be returned to public.</p>			
2.5	<p><b>Interference with radio waves</b> CR reported that expert advice indicated that radio and radar signals did not interfere with TV and radio reception as different band lengths were used. It was noted that geography was more likely to be the cause.</p>			
<b>3</b>	<b>Update on Project – SPC</b>			
3.1	<p>Update provided by SPC (CR) Two tenderers have been shortlisted and tender documentation and designs are currently being finalised. The physical works should commence approximately 6 months after the contract finalisation. Agreements are being finalised with stakeholders that will be impacted by the development as well as utilities. Further geotechnical investigation is currently in progress.</p>			
	<b>Questions and discussion</b>			
3.1	<p>NB asked about the timing for construction. CR replied that construction should begin around April 2008. PS requested that order of construction be provided to the CCC when possible.</p>	SPC to provide	SPC	Late 2007
3.2	<p>NH noted a dual rail line would be required to address problems at Banksia St. CR responded that this would happen when rail volumes increase, but it would not be likely in the immediate future. Also that it was part of the ARTC's agreement when they take over the rail line.</p>			
<b>4</b>	<b>Feedback on Penrhyn Estuary Habitat Enhancement Plan and Visual Amenity Management Plan</b>			

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
4.1	<p>Update provided by SPC (KP) Both plans were circulated to CCC members over the December/January period. Some comments have been received and these will be responded to. KP asked that written submissions on the Visual Amenity Management Plan be provided by the end of the week.</p>	All CCC Members to provide feedback on the two plans to SPC	CCC members	3 March 2007
	<b>Questions and discussion</b>			
4.2	<p>RE indicated that Randwick Council's comments on the Visual Amenity Management Plan were yet to be submitted. Some issues are that the Visual Impacts Plan doesn't consider the impact of the 4m noise wall; the impacts on the panorama of the bay; lighting is not included; and impacts on Foreshore Beach didn't consider residents and local users of the beach.</p>			
4.3	<p>PP conveyed to the meeting comments from residents, including questions about the source of water for the lagoon at the beach and whether this would pose a health hazard. Will there be a Gross Pollutant Trap (GPT) at the drain; would it be better to discharge at another location? MC responded that the drainage came from areas on other side of Foreshore Road. The design of the beach area should not allow water to pool. PS responded that Council would investigate whether a GPT would be required here. MC indicated that no problem with gross pollutants has been observed at this location and that the drains are mostly blocked at present.</p>			
4.4	<p>PP also raised concerns with possible discharge from ships and risks posed from this. CR responded that container ships don't take on or discharge ballast water or sewage within the Bay.</p>			
4.5	<p>PP asked who has provided shark nets in the bay, as sharks had recently been observed in the bay. These are generally erected by</p>			

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
	councils.			
4.6	<p>PP asked whether change facilities and outdoor showers would be provided. KP suggested that toilet facilities could be used for changing and no showering facilities were being currently considered.</p> <p>JB indicated he had understood that shower facilities would be provided. CR replied that SPC would re-examine the issue if there was a strong feeling for this.</p> <p>PS suggested that more amenities here would change the local nature of the beach and area.</p> <p>NH responded it had been popular because of the length of the beach, but this would change with the reduction in its size.</p>			
4.7	<p>JB noted comments from local residents expressing concern at the area of the beach to be lost. He suggested that original drawings showed a beach where now there is a rock wall.</p> <p>MC responded that while the beach would be smaller, the area for public access would be retained with the rock wall.</p> <p>KP noted that the reduction of the beach area had been raised as a concern in an email to her.</p> <p>MC responded that intention was originally to provide a beach, but in order to provide a stable beach a 1:20 slope was required. There is insufficient area for a stable beach to be created between the flushing channel and Foreshore Road. The rock wall is necessary to stabilize the channel.</p> <p>JB noted that local residents' desire for a beach.</p>			
4.8	<p>PS asked whether a revised plan would be issued.</p> <p>MC responded that revised plans with comments incorporated would be prepared and issued to the Department of Planning and Department of</p>	SPC to provide	SPC	

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
	Environment and Heritage for approval. The submitted plans could be provided to others.	revised plans to CCC when ready		
<b>5</b>	<b>Distribution of newsletters – map to be presented by SPC</b>			
5.1	A map of the distribution area was provided to the CCC. KP outlined the process for newsletter distribution via a specialist company, with follow up checks on the efficiency of distribution. As a result of the last newsletter eight written comments were received as well as a number of phone calls.			
5.2	NH reiterated that contact with the Kaloura Centre should be continued, even if responses from here were few. She also reported that with Orica's distributions some new housing developments had been overlooked. KP replied that contact with the Kaloura Centre would be continued. The new housing developments were also noted.	SPC to ensure	KP	
5.3	RE asked whether non –English communications would be provided. KP replied that this would be the case when construction commenced.	SPC to ensure	KP	
5.4	JB requested that in future newsletters the logo and designs are placed so as not to obscure the photo.	SPC to ensure	KP	
<b>6</b>	<b>Section 96 amendments, approvals and process for these – Botany Council</b>			
6.1	Copies of the applications for S96 modifications of consent conditions and the approvals of the modifications were distributed to the meeting. PS reported that Council had not received this from the Department of Planning (DoP). The DoP advised that the changes to Section 96 were not being publicised. PS noted that this response from DoP was unsatisfactory as in the opinion of the Council these changes should have been re-advertised.			
6.2	JB had understood that a representative from DoP would be attending the CCC meetings.	SPC to review	SPC	

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
	KP responded that DoP was not required to attend these meetings. Chair indicated that the DoP or DEC could be invited to meetings when required.			
<b>7</b>	<b>Combined pedestrian/cycleway at Foreshore Beach – Randwick Council</b>			
7.1	RE reported that it was suggested at the Randwick Council meeting that the cycleway be extended for the whole distance of the pedestrian way on the southern side and that it link with other cycleways. PS reported that Botany Council supported this view.			
	Questions and discussion			
7.2	PP noted the Port breaks the opportunity for a continuous cycleway. He asked whose responsibility it was to provide missing areas of cycleway. PS replied that it was council with support from the RTA. MC noted constraints of the port with regard to the cycleway. CR cited safety issues with cycles crossing areas of high truck movements. RE suggested that if a cycle path could not be located on the southern side that bike racks be provided at the end of the cycle path.	RE to provide SPC with of Randwick Council's cycle routes study.  SPC to review Randwick Council's cycle route study and respond to issue of extending cycleway.	Randwick Council  SPC	
<b>8</b>	<b>Comments from community on proposed prohibition of public access to Penrhyn Estuary – Botany Council.</b>			
8.1	PS reported council's support for limiting public access to environmentally sensitive areas of the Penrhyn Estuary.			
8.2	NH suggested some system should be provided for public access to the estuary.			
8.3	PS suggested that the use of fencing be rationalised as there seems to be an over use of fencing in the current plan.			
<b>9</b>	<b>General business</b>			

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
9.1	<p>JB asked what assurances exist for responsibility for the long term maintenance of public areas, citing poor maintenance of some areas of Sir Joseph Banks Park.</p> <p>CR responded that SPC is committed to maintain these areas, and this is embedded in the EIS.</p> <p>NH noted that some areas in Sir Joseph Banks Park have been deliberately left in their natural state.</p>			
9.2	<p>PP asked whether the CCC thought that proposed toilet amenities would be adequate.</p> <p>CCC members generally agreed that these would be adequate.</p>			
	<p><b>Next Meeting/s- agenda items</b>  <b>Tuesday April 3, 3.30pm</b></p>			

These minutes have been endorsed by the Chair, Roberta Ryan.



## Community issues about the expansion project

(Nov 06 – Feb 07)

Number	Date	Issue
1	13 Feb 07	VAMP  Security conflict at boat ramp. Outfall from stormwater drain – pollution, health risks Change room facilities Shower and foot washing at ramp
2	16 Feb 07	Insufficient provision of parking
3	Various dates	Insufficient parking Recreational anglers not being treated fairly Length of beach being shortened Quality of water near stormwater drain at beach Not listening to community No response Introduction of no parking on Foreshore Road (possible) Concerns not being tabled at CCC meeting
4	12 Feb 07	Parking for boat ramp
5	9 Feb 07	Lack of parking
6	9 Feb 07	Parking and safety of ramp
7	9 Feb 07	Parking
8	9 Feb 07/15 Dec 2006	Parking
9	8 Feb 07	Parking
10	11 Jan 2007	Comments on Penrhyn Estuary Habitat Enhancement Plan Various issues
11	19 Dec 06	PEHEP plans not on website
12	19 Dec 06	Need beach and more parking
13	19 Dec 06	Access to Penrhyn Estuary with rail corridor
14	17 Dec 06	Car parking

Number	Date	Issue
		Beach for leaving boats
15	16 Dec 06	Sharing of car parking facilities – not adequate
16	16 Dec 06	Parking not adequate
17	15 Dec 06	Ecosystems of the bay being impacted Loss of beach Insufficient communication Lack of fishing platforms
18	8 Dec 06	Parking Compensation to fisherman
19	8 Dec 06	Inadequate parking Lack of fishing platforms in bay
20	7 Dec 06	Loss of recreational shipping Closure of Foreshore Road Breakwall length
21	7 Dec 06	Various issues Soundproofing of homes Hale Street link More parking for boat ramp 3 additional fishing platforms Design of brochure
22	24 Nov 06	Parking Compensation for 'loss' of area for fishing Fishing piers