

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

for

LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLANS

prepared for

WATER STREET and

CASUARINA PARK

in

NORTH ARM COVE

Prepared by Pam Fletcher
Registered Landscape Architect

Document No. 1002/5
Dated 7 February 2011

SUMMARY TABLE – ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following responses apply to Park Concept Plans: Water Street (Dwg No 1002/1 dated 26 July 2010) and Casuarina Park (Dwg No 1002/2 dated 10 August 2010)

GENERAL COMMENTS:	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommendations by designer:	No. ¹
Responses	Support the plans.	Some supporting respondents included requests for minor alterations to the current plans.	Refer to the table below for details of proposed recommendations for alterations to the current concept plans.	51
	Against the plans or those who would like significant modification.	Where modifications are practical and achievable recommendations for alterations of the plans have been included.	Refer to the table below for details of proposed recommendations for alterations to the current concept plans.	22
	Responses that did not state clearly their support or objections .			5
	Responses that objected to a boat ramp in Heros Bay without indicating their response to the proposed plans.			13 of which 3 support Beauty Pt
	Responses that were unrelated to the plans and instead voiced their concern at not being able to build on their land.			4
	Total number of respondents.	As some respondents have asked that their one submission be counted as if from each individual, responses have been counted by individuals rather than submissions.	A total of 95 individuals responded though includes a group of unknown number (NACRA) which has been counted as one response. It is likely that members of NACRA have also responded individually so should not be counted twice.	95
	Withdraw their support in light of Council's plan to increase the rates but did not state they			1

¹ Number of individual respondents indicating this response – total of 95 individuals responded though includes a group of unknown number (NACRA) – responses have been counted by individuals rather than submissions as some respondents have asked that their one submission be counted as if from each individual.

	objected to the proposed development.			
GENERAL COMMENTS:	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommendations by designer:	No.
Boat ramp	Strongly support the need for an adequate trailer boat ramp in North Arm Cove on the understanding that the sites subject of the plans do not provide sufficient water access or parking.	Several respondents have indicated that the proposals are a good first step but that further investigation should be made to provide a full boat ramp in North Arm Cove.	<p>Initial investigation of sites in North Arm Cove show that for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Medina Bay - LPMA indicated that they are unlikely to approve a boat ramp on the eastern shore of the NAC peninsula; ○ Heros Bay - significant community objection to this site, currently used for swimming, limited water capacity for boat launching; ○ Bulga Creek - LPMA indicated that they are unlikely to approve a boat ramp on the eastern shore of the NAC peninsula – site also appears to be located within the marine sanctuary; ○ Beauty Point (foreshore access is privately owned) <p>As these listed sites variously have factors against their development, further investigation be made into the current provision in nearby towns. Consideration be given to upgrading nearby ramps to improve facilities for the wider community rather than providing a new facility in North Arm Cove. Investigate a cooperative arrangement with Port Stephens Council for upgrading the ramp at Karuah. The Karuah boat ramp has recently been increased to two lanes. Council is programing subject to funding further works to provide 2 pontoons and to seal the car park to increase trailer parking from 24 to up to 50. This ramp is accessible at all times and is some 20 minutes from North Arm Cove. Port Stephens Council is aiming to upgrade the ramp to regional status.</p>	10
Boat ramp cont'd	Support a boat ramp being provided at one or both of the locations subject of the concept	LPMA indicated they are unlikely to support a boat ramp on the eastern foreshore of the North Arm Cove peninsula.	Refer to recommendation above.	13

plans.

GENERAL COMMENTS:	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommendations by designer:	No.
	Recommend Heros Bay as a site for a full boat ramp.	Heros Bay is not considered entirely suitable for the reasons stated above. 13 respondents have written to specifically and only to object to the siting of a boat ramp at Heros Bay.	Refer to recommendation above.	2
	Demand for a boat ramp comes from a limited number of people. Council should undertake a usage survey to determine the real level of demand. A previous NACRA survey prioritised roads and drainage ahead of boating facilities.	Of the 51 respondents (individuals not submission numbers) 10 have indicated that the proposed plans do not fully satisfy the desire for a boat ramp and have asked that Council continue to pursue the search for an appropriate site. A total of 95 individuals responded. Of the 22 against the proposals 10 expressed the need for a boat ramp (not a launch site). Council has previously undertaken a recreation needs survey and provision of boating facilities was requested.	Refer to recommendation above.	1
	Against a boat ramp being provided at Heros Bay.	Noted.	Refer to recommendation above.	14
	Prefer Medina Bay public reserve.	Currently there is no vehicular access to the foreshore at Council's public reserve in Medina Bay. The site is a relatively steep gully and the foreshore some distance from the road.	Refer to recommendation above.	2
	Boating facilities are available elsewhere eg Bulga Creek.	LPMA indicated that they are unlikely to approve a boat ramp on the eastern shore of the NAC peninsula.	Refer to recommendation above.	1
Expertise	The jetty requires design by qualified maritime engineers. It will impact on seagrass beds, boats travelling along the foreshore and commercial fishing. Potential fall heights from the jetty must be considered and hand rails included.	In regards to the further design required the comments echo text notes on the plan.	No change.	2

GENERAL COMMENTS:	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommendations by designer:	No.
Expertise cont'd	Selection of landscape architect to prepare the plans show a bias towards parks and gardens considerations by GLC – need to include Council engineers and marine authorities.	<p>In preparing the concept plan the following authorities and documents were consulted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Port Stephens Foreshore Mgt Plan 2009</i> prepared by Umwelt Environmental Consultants who provided ecological and engineering strategies for the management of Port Stephens. • <i>NSW Maritime</i> who recommended a site on the western foreshore of the peninsular not the eastern side as preferred by this respondent. Also undertook a desktop review of Maritime's policies. • <i>Australian Standard 4997-2005 Guidelines for the design of Maritime Structures and Boat Launching Ramps – NSW Public Works Guidelines.</i> • <i>Land and Property Management Authority</i> who indicated a lack of support for a boat ramp on the eastern foreshore of the peninsula. <p>The concept plan establishes a strategy for discussion then the appropriate professionals develop the scheme in the detailed design and construction drawing phase as noted on the plan.</p>	No change.	1
Park names	Suggests formalising name of reserves in consult with the community.	Noted.	Council to pursue formalising names of reserves.	2
Water supply	Recommends that flushing of motors and cleaning of fish be prohibited if a water outlet is provided.	Water outlets are not proposed for motor flushing or fish cleaning though water access will be required to establish any new plantings.	No change.	1

CASUARINA PARK	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
Jetty	<p>Supports jetty (with pontoon) in T shape formation for improved water access. Benefits of jetty include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved ease of use for aged residents • Use by water taxi / ferry from Nelson Bay and elsewhere • Emergency evacuation point during bushfire 	<p>The plan shows the jetty in symbolic form. Further investigation is required as indicated in the plan text notes to determine the most appropriate format. Requires engineering input. Another respondent indicated that using the jetty for evacuation may encourage a last minute mindset and thus create a dangerous situation.</p>	<p>Configuration of the jetty and pontoon to be determined during detailed design development with reference to the community desire for a T formation.</p>	17
	<p>Believes the use of the pontoon will be abused by people tying their boat up for longer than the time to the next tide. Concerned at how the use of the pontoon will be policed and potential inappropriate use for drinking.</p>	<p>This is a societal problem. Perhaps a committee could be established to manage the sites. Would have to be carefully selected to ensure a cross section of the community was represented. The role of the committee could be to encourage a dialogue in the community about appropriate use of the facilities. A sign could cover use by tourists. Obviously Council can't have an employee on the ground to monitor the situation. Because it can't be policed is that a reason not to provide facilities?</p>	<p>Establish a local committee to undertake a number of roles including the role to encourage appropriate use of the proposed jetty and pontoon.</p>	1
	<p>There is a gentle back flow of water along the shoreline when the tide is going out which may lead to sediment build-up on the jetty.</p>	<p>Tidal activity must be investigated in the design of any jetty as noted on the plan.</p>	<p>Ensure that tidal movements and sediment deposition is considered during detailed design development of the boating structures.</p>	1
	<p>Believes DPI and NSW Maritime will not support the pontoon structure due to the location of the oyster leases (believes DPI will not support their removal) and for safety reasons.</p>	<p>That would be for these relevant authorities to comment. The proposed plans, amended as determined from this consultation phase, should be submitted to LPMA et al for formal feedback.</p>	<p>Amend plan as noted in this table and submit to LPMA and other relevant authorities for comment.</p>	1

CASUARINA PARK	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
Jetty cont'd	Believes there is a general perception of property owners on the foreshore that oyster leases keep jet skis away (a noise problem).	This comment is made in light of the possibility that the leases in front of the reserve may not be renewed by DPI if Council make application when they expire. Even if they aren't renewed there are leases to either side of the reserves which would continue in being successful at keeping jet skis at bay. There may be the chance that jet skis will use the jetty but I would imagine that they need a trailer and vehicle to be launched and retrieved so Casuarina Park would not be an attraction.	Investigate the oyster leases off the foreshore to determine their expiry date. Make application to halt renewal in the vicinity of the reserves. According to the <i>Sustainable Aquaculture Strategy</i> for the NSW Oyster Industry dated 2006, leases should not be located offshore or 50m either side of areas of public recreation.	1
	Recommends limiting use of the jetty to 7am to 7pm.	Limiting use to daylight hours would not be popular with boat users but would please adjacent residents in Eastslope Way. Whilst this is the only respondent to make this suggestion several others indicated concerns at the impacts of the jetty on neighbours.	Further investigation required during the detail design phase to determine the feasibility of limiting use of the jetty to daylight hours to mitigate impacts on adjacent residents.	1
	Supports the option to locate the jetty centrally rather than to the south as shown on the plan to minimise disturbance to the neighbours.	Existing location of mangroves, extent of mudflats at low tide, ground topography of the reserve and the presence of a rock shelf at the southern end led to the siting of the jetty at the southern end of the foreshore. A considerably longer jetty may well be required if centrally located along with the removal of mangroves (which would require a permit under Part 7 of the Fisheries Management Act). Relocating the jetty centrally would necessitate the relocation of the proposed dinghy storage racks to the southern side of the lower area. This switch is unlikely to alter the possible impacts on the adjoining neighbour.	No change.	11
	Jetty may need to extend 70 to 100m due to the shallow mudflats.	Noted. The length of the jetty on the plan was estimated from the aerial photography. The final length is subject to more accurate survey as noted on the plan.	No change.	1
	Do not support the inclusion of a jetty at this site.		No change.	24
	Supports a public wharf but located at Medina Bay.	Currently there is no vehicular access to the foreshore at Council's public reserve in Medina Bay. The site is a	No change.	1

CASUARINA PARK	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
		relatively steep gully and the foreshore some distance from the road.		
Jetty cont'd	Council have poorly rewarded the volunteer work of the neighbours of the park by the location of the jetty and pontoon. Believes the proposal is a regional boat ramp in disguise.	LPMA have clearly indicated that they would not permit a boat ramp at either of these locations. Council actively pursuing a more appropriate site for a boat ramp would address this comment. I'm sure Council is very grateful for the volunteer work undertaken by the neighbouring residents but that should not influence the future development of public land that could benefit the whole community.	No change.	1
Boat launch site	Launch site should be relocated to below the existing accessway (ie more centrally).	Refer to comments previously made for the location of the jetty.	No change.	1
Dinghy storage racks	Believes few people use the park. Believes that comments that indicate that there is a growing need for boat facilities are false. Doesn't see need for storage racks. Council should undertake a survey of existing users and boat owners. Believes NACRA leadership has been high jacked by the few residents wanting boat facilities for personal gain. Believes the need for boat facilities is also being pushed by the B and B owners for commercial gain at public expense.	In its current state the reserve does not appear to be heavily used for boat launching based on the number of dinghies stored onsite. Distance from the road may account for this low use. Water Street appears to be more heavily used based on anecdotal evidence from residents and the number of boats stored onsite. A cost benefit analysis is required to determine if projected use justifies the cost of the proposed infrastructure in this reserve. Council could either stage the proposed works or undertake a letter drop to determine level of need or ask for boat owners to register interest in applying for a rack. The latter comments are conjecture and not echoed by other respondents.	Request boat owners to register interest in applying for a dinghy boat storage rack. Prepare a preliminary cost estimate of the proposed works of the amended approved plan. Match supply to demand. Stage implementation of works to provide boating facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage One – to provide for existing use of the park and to contribute to better management of Port Stephens waterway provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Foreshore protection and launch site ○ Storage racks – based on demand ○ Stormwater management • Stage Two: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jetty (if increased use can support cost of provision). ○ Additional storage racks based on registered demand 	1

CASUARINA PARK	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
Dinghy storage racks cont'd	Vertical stacking of boats as proposed is not preferred – easier to stack horizontally.	<p>Vertical stacking has been proposed as it uses less area in plan. The site is sloping and does not appear to have a sufficiently large flat area to accommodate horizontal storage in the current scheme. I spoke with an officer from Port Stephens Council re storage racks in Port Stephens (Bryce Cameron ph 4980 0356). He made the following observations about the management of storage racks from his experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Where no fees for use apply the racks are monopolised by yacht owners; o Supply of racks cannot meet demand; o Where fees apply (\$100pa in Pittwater Council area) Council can police use of racks by periodically removing all boats from public lands not stored in racks. If the community are made aware of this policy then there may be more chance of the community adhering to the policy; o Recommends vertical racks as they occupy much less land area (2m²) than horizontal racks (6-8m²). Believes less lifting is required to secure vertically. Vertical racks are commonly used in Pittwater. Constructed of gal. metal. Recommends to charge by the m² rather than the slot which would encourage vertical racks. 	Retain vertical stacking as proposed. Add text note to plan to indicate that fees will apply and that non-compliance will be policed and result in removal of boats from the public land where not stored in storage racks provided by Council. Use the proposed committee to communicate the policy to the community as well as provide signs at the site.	2
	A nominal annual fee should apply to the storage racks with a max number of racks per household.	Another respondent has raised the issue of desirability of use if racks attract a fee. It may encourage some to continue using the grassed areas for storage. This respondent appears to be concerned about a few groups monopolising the racks. Policing will obviously be an ongoing issue. Refer to above comments.	Refer to recommendation above.	1
	Only 14 spaces are required in the proposed dinghy storage	It is anticipated that with improvements to the boat access more users will be attracted to the site.	Request boat owners to register interest in applying for a dinghy boat storage rack. Prepare a preliminary cost	1

CASUARINA PARK	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
	racks (7x the current use).		estimate of the proposed works of the amended approved plan. Match supply to demand.	
Dinghy storage racks cont'd	Dinghy storage racks should be adjacent to the launch site for ease of access by aged users.	Existing ground topography dictates the location of the storage racks plus the desire to keep them away from the southern neighbour.	No change.	1
Vehicular access	Proposed accessway should be sealed to reduce dust and erosion.	The final surface treatment should ensure erosion control and thus dust control as noted on the plan.	No change.	2
	Does not support angled parking on the roadside would prefer parallel parking to accommodate trailers.	The concept is not to encourage use of the facilities for short stay but to permanently store dinghies onsite. The angled on street parking is to service those users. Tourists or short stay users can still park in Eastslope Way. The proposed parking would only take up one car/trailer parking space on the street.	No change.	1
	Turning bay should be relocated to the southern side of the accessway and located west of the existing BBQ. (The respondent enclosed a modified plan with the submission).	The turning bay has been located on the northern side to allow a car with a trailer to drive into the reserve to the end of the accessway, offload the dinghy and temporarily store it to the south side of the accessway. Then reserve the car and trailer into the turning bay and exit the reserve in a forward motion. The location of the turning bay on this respondent's modified plan does not allow this operation.	No change.	1
	The vehicle manoeuvring area on the lower portion of the reserve is insufficient.	The current concept does not allow for vehicle access to this lower area	No change.	1
	Insufficient parking provided including for those storing dinghies, potential space for parking is diminished by the provision of picnic facilities and the excessive retention of vegetation. The northern portion of the reserve should be totally cleared to allow easier	Off street parking is not provided in the scheme. The intention is that boats are dropped off and dinghies stored onsite. Parking is available on street. To provide trailer parking as requested would require two way access and turning circle. Neither of which could be accommodated without substantial loss of existing mature trees, green open space and picnic grounds.	No change.	1

CASUARINA PARK	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
	car and trailer access and additional parking.			
Pedestrian access	Would like to see a path for disabled access to the jetty and the foreshore included.	Current grade across the reserve from the road to the foreshore is generally 1:10. To provide disabled access would require a switchback route. There would also be cost implications for the jetty to ensure it was safe for disabled access.	Provision of disabled access is subject to funding. The plan should be modified to provide adequate access to the foreshore for boat haulage and aged access.	11
	The distance from the boat drop off site and the storage area is too far for manual handling. A pathway should be provided to allow transport by small manual trailers.	This could be accommodated but restricted to ensure only small trailers are used. It is proposed not to permit vehicles in the lower portion of the reserve. The entry point to the accessway would need to be located and controlled to prohibit vehicular access.	Modify the plan to provide adequate pedestrian access to the foreshore for boat haulage by small trailer and for aged access.	2
	Access to the foreshore should be maintained.	The respondent's modified plan shows no planting along the southern half of the foreshore to accommodate this access. To stabilise the foreshore would require the proposed rock armouring to be extended. Such access in this area could compromise the existing mangroves and foreshore stability. Also swimming is not compatible with boat launching.	No change.	1
Foreshore protection	The eroded foreshore is the result of the stormwater drain.	As indicated in the text notes on the plan, several factors may cause the erosion including the drain and further investigation is required to identify the problem as noted on the plan.	No change.	1
Vegetation	The nature of the site means that the proposed amenities cannot be viewed from the street increasing the chances of vandalism.	Proposed planting should consider this aspect and allow views as possible.	Add a text note to the plan re applying principles of <i>Crime Prevention through Design</i> .	1
	Would like to see vegetation removed from the foreshore to allow better access for the community to swim.	Swimming at this reserve is not compatible with proposed boat launching and the presence of mangroves. Loss of vegetation could also compromise the stability of the bank and allow erosion to occur.	No change.	1

CASUARINA PARK	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
Vegetation con't	Currently maintained by the adjacent neighbours and strongly recommend good screen plantings for these properties.	Appears to support solution as shown on plan.	No change.	3
	Screening vegetation of park boundaries should be undertaken on neighbouring properties at landholders request and not within the scarce open space.	Not requested by any other respondent. I'm not aware that such a principle has been applied to any other park in the LGA.	No change.	1
	Substantial removal of vegetation is required to make the boating facilities safely functional and planting should be limited to turfing to the foreshore.	Turfing alone will not stabilise the foreshore. In the current position the location of the jetty and launch site are not encumbered by the proposed plantings.	No change.	1
	Less vegetation with more shade trees in lawn is required.	The proposed planting is supplementary to the existing and does not encroach on level areas. Is proposed around the perimeter and on the steeper banks for screening, erosion control, foreshore stabilisation and stormwater filtration.	No change.	11
Amenities	Suggest inclusion of toilets.	Currently visitors must return to the service station on the highway just south of the Tea Gardens turnoff. North Arm Cove would benefit from the inclusion of public toilets. However, provision of a toilet at this reserve would depend on the existing provision of services. Perhaps a unisex composting toilet could be considered. Maintenance is an issue given the issues raised in the responses to the lack of maintenance already occurring in the village. Another possible role for the proposed committee.	Further investigation is required to determine the best location for provision of a public toilet in North Arm Cove. Management of this facility can be included in the roles of the proposed committee if to be sited in this reserve. Amend plan as required to accommodate a public toilet.	13

	The picnic tables be replaced with new covered units.	There is no design reason against providing the same.	Amend the plan to include new covered picnic tables to replace the existing mobile units.	3
CASUARINA PARK	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
Amenities cont'd	Concerned at future of commemorative garden and treatment of graves and memorials.	The proposed concept does not alter how this portion of the reserve is managed or used other than proposed additional planting to supplement existing and to screen the southern neighbours. The role to manage the gardens could be given to the suggested committee.	Include maintenance of the commemorative garden in roles of the proposed committee.	1
	Maintenance has not been undertaken by Council since mid-2010. The vandalised BBQ has not been repaired and the bin has not be replaced in line with the new collection service. The resident volunteers have withdrawn their services to maintain the park.	As previously indicated perhaps a committee to manage the proposed facilities is established with a role to provide maintenance to the reserves in concert with Council.	Include maintenance of the parks in roles of the proposed committee.	1
	Replacement BBQ could be a gas powered unit fuelled by user BYO bottles or free electric.	A decision would need to be made in the context of Council's OH & S policy. The gas connection point on the BBQ under a BYO system could be subject to vandalism and accidental damage. Plan notes gas or electric.	No change.	3
	Questions demand for BBQ, maintenance thereof.	If the reserve is to be developed as proposed then one would assume an increase in demand for picnic facilities including a BBQ.	No change.	1
	Picnic facilities should be provided in the commemorative garden area and the area fenced.	Not required if the picnic area to the north is retained. Could be accommodated if required. Would require re-exhibiting to the community as it is likely to be a sensitive issue.	No change.	1
Stormwater	Keen to see stormwater drainage incorporated into the scheme.	This comment appears to imply a general review of the stormwater system in the area.	Further investigation of the stormwater system in the wider area is required during the detailed design development.	1
	Under road drain has been sealed and does not flow.	A maintenance issue requiring attention.	Further investigation of the drain under Eastslope Way is required. Provide maintenance or repair as required.	1

CASUARINA PARK	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
Current concept	Plan is unworkable without major alteration. Plan does not fully realise the potential of the reserve. Concerned that parks are being vegetated by a few to the exclusion of the whole community. Access to the water for launching of trailer able boats is required.	These respondents have an alternate agenda to that proposed in the plan. The proposal caters for a low key option whilst the respondents propose a more intensive development of the site that few respondents have requested.	Recommend changes as noted in this table.	2
	Proposal will disrupt the tranquil village atmosphere and the native flora and fauna. Do not want to be disturbed by associated noise, day or night. The amenity of Eastslope Way is already compromised by trail bike riders. The proposals for the site would increase noise issues and reduce the area of greenery.	I expect in any location where bushland is near to housing trail bikes are a perennial problem. This could well be a transient problem due to the age of the users. I wouldn't expect the launching of boats at this site would impact on all living in Eastslope Way. I do not believe that development at this site as proposed in the plan would mean the loss of greenery though the on street angled parking area may impact on the streetscape.	Further investigation required during the detail design phase to determine the feasibility of limiting use of the jetty to daylight hours to mitigate impacts on adjacent residents.	3
	Not desirable to provide a costly ramp and turn the park into a parking area. Site seen as a park with picnic facilities. Funds are better spent on road and drainage repairs and the community hall.	51 respondents support the scheme. 22 objected to the proposal. 5 objected to undertaking any development.	No change.	5
	Antisocial behaviour is on the rise in North Arm Cove. Facilities for families will reduce this activity.	The comment is made on the basis of undertaking an intensive upgrade of the park including the provision of a boat ramp. It is believed that increased development will improve surveillance and thus reduce antisocial behaviour.	No change.	10

WATER STREET	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
Boating facilities	The needs for boating have been subordinated by park design.	The brief to prepare the concept was informed by the results of the investigations undertaken to establish permissible development within the reserves and on the foreshore and included advice from Council, LPMA, NSW Maritime, Public Works, Dept. of Primary Industries and the Marine Park Authority. No personal bias dictated the brief but rather the restrictions placed by the relevant authorities.	No change.	1
	Do not support the proposal as will increase noise in the early hours, cause littering and will cause the destruction of the fig. Not enough parking provided. Ramp should be located at Casuarina Park.	The fig is protected in the proposed scheme. I think this scheme does no more than make the existing site fit for the existing use.	No change.	2
Dinghy storage racks	Supports horizontal dinghy rack storage as shown – recommends heavily galvanised steel as per Corlette.	Refer to relevant note under Casuarina Park.	Change racks to vertical storage. Add text note to plan to indicate that fees will apply and that non-compliance will be policed and result in removal of boats from the public land where not stored in storage racks provided by Council. Use the proposed committee to communicate the policy to the community as well as provide signs at the site.	2
	If only one storage area at Water St – preference should be for the southern side due to proximity of house at 34 Cove Boulevard.	Changing the racks from horizontal to vertical may alter the pattern of racks. Note comment re adjacent neighbour.	Request boat owners to register interest in applying for a dinghy boat storage rack. Prepare a preliminary cost estimate of the proposed works of the amended approved plan. Match supply to demand.	2
	A nominal annual fee should apply to the storage racks with a max number of racks per household.	Refer to comments under Casuarina Park.	Refer to recommendations above.	1
Vehicular access	No parking signs should be placed on the accessway to ensure a clearway at all times.	Explanatory signs will be required.	Add text note to plan to indicate signs for no parking are required.	1

WATER STREET	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
Vehicular access con'td	Sealed turning circle not required – could be turfed.	Turfing alone will not adequately stabilise the road surface. Reinforced turfing could be considered but would be an engineering decision as to suitability given the grades.	Add a text note to the plan that further investigation is required in detailed design development to determine suitable surface to stabilise vehicular accessway.	1
	Insufficient parking provided including for those storing dinghies, potential space for parking is diminished by the provision of picnic facilities and the excessive retention of vegetation.	Parking is not provided in the scheme. The intention is that boats are dropped off and dinghies stored onsite. Parking is available on street in Cove Boulevard.	No change.	1
	Access road and turning bay should be sealed – if done adjacent neighbours may be more accepting of the plan.	Appears to support solution as shown on plan if road is sealed.	No change.	2
Foreshore protection	Recommends that the vertical sea walls on the adjacent properties be replaced with rock armouring (rocks and blocks at 45°) as the walls will eventually fail under the continuous wave action.	The plan note could be altered to recommend that the adjacent property owners investigate in concert with Council improved ways to armour their portion of the foreshore – this would obviously apply to all similar situations along the foreshore (as recommended in the <i>Port Stephens Foreshore Mgt Plan 2009</i>).	Amend text note on the plan to recommend that the adjacent property owners investigate in concert with Council improved ways to armour their portion of the foreshore as recommended in the <i>Port Stephens Foreshore Mgt Plan 2009</i> .	2
	Do not support a rock armoured ramp but a concrete structure.	Ramp construction is to be investigated in the next phase of the process with consideration been given to efficacy of use of each option and appropriate foreshore protection as noted on plan.	No change.	2
	Support a shallow tidal pool for foot washing and suggest it be also used as a play area and perhaps incorporated in the stormwater system.	I imagine there would be issues of contaminated water if it was part of the stormwater system. I didn't envisage a very large pool – just to allow foot cleaning – and using estuary water rather than stormwater.	No change.	2

WATER STREET	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
Foreshore protection con'td	Supports rock armouring of the foreshore but the reserve should be extended out to the adjacent property lines.	Extension of the reserve would only achieve a few extra metres of park area and not materially increase the opportunity to expand facility provision. In line with climate change projections this land would inevitably be inundated. As quoted in the <i>Port Stephens Foreshore Mgt Plan 2009</i> : 'it would appear that the erosion problem exists where the foreshore has been reclaimed. The reclamations have been protected with vertical seawalls.' The report goes onto recommend that foreshore structures in North Arm Cove should be rehabilitated or removed (see Fig. 10.2). <i>Rehabilitation comprises converting the existing vertical sea walls to porous slopes (2:1 H:V) rock rubble revetments.</i> The rock armouring proposed at Water Street as recommended above allows access to the water and accommodates sea level rises as and if they occur.	No change.	3
	Neither adjacent properties have been inundated at king high tides (2.05m) – <i>'prognostication that this might happen as a consequence of envisaged sea level rise is supposition.'</i>	Under the <i>NSW Coastal Policy 1997</i> and <i>SEPP 71 – Coastal Protection</i> Council is required to consider the likely impact of coastal processes and hazards on development including the potential effects of climate change.	No change.	1
	Highly unlikely that a wave height of 900mm would occur in North Arm Cove. Believes the foreshore erosion is minimal.	I have designed to the worst case scenario based on the information provided. Further investigation is required to determine likely local impacts. If the existing trees are not protected on the foreshore ongoing erosion will not be halted whatever the wave height. The plan notes that further investigation during detailed design is required to finalise the final levels of rock armouring.	No change.	1
	The small amount of wrack that gathers on the foreshore should not be an environmental impediment to foreshore	The wrack is not dictating the proposed treatment. Foreshore protection drives the proposed treatments. The nature of the mudflats and the tidal range dictates the possible launching options.	No change.	1

WATER STREET	Comment by respondent:	Response by designer:	Recommended amendments:	No.
	reclamation and development of adequate boating facilities.			
Vegetation	Support the grassing and planting shown east of the turning area but suggest planting the western portion of the reserve to reduce mowing, to increase privacy for adjacent residents and to limit the number of cars and people using the site.	Planting maintenance is also a an ongoing cost so may not reduce costs. Low rather than screen planting would be advisable to assist in crime prevention. Road is proposed to be bollarded to prohibit parking on the reserve. The western area could be planted subject to establishment and maintenance costs.	Extend planted areas on the western portion of the site and note areas to be planted over a staged program as funding and maintenance crews / volunteers are available. Ongoing maintenance could be a role for the proposed committee.	2
	Supports retention of existing plantings	Noted.	No change.	2
	Removal of a substantial amount of the existing vegetation is required to accommodate the required parking.	Removal of vegetation on this site will not markedly improve the amount of parking available. The vegetation has more value to foreshore protection and street amenity.	No change.	1
Stormwater	Keen to see stormwater drainage incorporated into the scheme.	This comment appears to imply a general review of the stormwater system in the area.	Further investigation of the stormwater system in the wider area is required during the detailed design development.	1
	Stormwater must be remediated to avoid deposition of road base in the cove.	Appears to support solution as shown on plan.	No change.	3
Stormwater cont'd	Drainage should be piped from Cove Boulevard to the foreshore.	Stormwater management is best determined by GLC Engineers but I'm assuming they'd want some sort of treatment of the stormwater to remove contaminants before it enters the waterway.	No change.	2
Amenities	Recommend seats / tables be provided on the foreshore under the trees.	Am concerned that allowing users in amongst the planting on the foreshore that indiscriminate access will be gained to the water and thus not assist with the stabilisation of the foreshore.	Amend plan to provide a bench seat adjacent to the launch accessway outside of the fenced planting.	4
	The site should be developed primarily for boating facilities and other amenities excluded	The current proposal does not include other amenities and few respondents have asked for more than some bench seating.	See note above.	2

for safety reasons.
