

Meeting Notes

Meeting for CAC - North Head
February 28th , 2007

Time: 5.00 – 6.30pm
Venue: Roden Cutler Building

Present:

- Deb Mosman
- Tony Iacona
- Ian Freeman
- Cecily McGee
- Doug Sewell
- Judy Reizes
- Scott Hedge (Manly Council)
- Garry Stewart
- Ted Moore
- Brian Evesson
- Philip Jenkyn
- Atticus Fleming (AWC)
- Jamie Rockcliff (AWC)
- Joss Bentley (AWC)
- Nick Hollo (Trust)
- Geoff Bailey (Trust)
- Jessica Sartor (Trust)
- Peter Jensen (Trust)

Apologies:

- Col John Platt
- Jennie Minifie
- Chris Skinner
- Roger Dobson
- Damien Cobley-Finch
- David Barr
- Genia McCaffrey
- Angelo Tsirekas

Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and give an update on:

- Capital works, including the visitor's centre and walking tracks;
- Sanctuary progress;
- The Draft North Head Operational plan (Atticus Fleming AWC); and
- Leasing

Issues Raised

Walking tracks

The metal mesh tracks seem to dominate the landscape. Is it possible to use a variety of different tracks as opposed to the one system?

- The Trust carried out extensive research to determine the most suitable type of track. It was decided that the raised metal system was the most appropriate because of its low impact on the dunes in both the construction and installation phase.

Has the Trust determined a circuit walkway that goes around the headland that could possibly link up with the Spit to Manly walk?

- Linkages to surrounding areas and a circuit walkway on the headland are desirable but the Trust will need to work together with National Parks and other land managers to determine the alignment.

What is the expected life of the walkways?

- While this is difficult to conclusively say, we are expecting the tracks to last 5-10 years.

How will the new track link up at the Southern end where the North Fort Museum is?

- This will need to be resolved in negotiation with the North Fort Museum. Ideally we would like to see a direct link through to the Fairfax lookout. (Since the last CAC meeting this link has been provided.)

Management of Public On Site

What kind of controls will be put into place to manage the public when the site is opened?

- The Trust will have both directional and interpretive signage over the site. The Trust's volunteers will be working in the visitors centre as well as conducting their regular tours. We will also have security on site undertaking 24 hour patrol. Public access and issues that may arise will be monitored.

When will the carrying capacity of the site be determined?

- Initially, we will not be limiting the number of people onto the site. We do not anticipate large numbers of visitors. The following stages of the sanctuary operational management will determine some of the constraints and management measures for access to the site.

Other

Will the Trust be defining or re-instating the Avenue of Honour?

- We will clean back some of the sand so it is more visible and provide interpretive signage.

Is the Avenue of Honour an heritage item and has it been addressed in the Conservation Management Plan?

- We have not specifically addressed the Avenue of Honour. We realise it is an important heritage item. It is in a stable condition and we do not plan any works that may impact on it. As a result it has not been given a high priority in the development of the CMPs.

Will you provide access through the obstacle course?

- We plan to leave the obstacles as they are and erect interpretive signage.

The Sanctuary

How will the Trust implement the plan?

- The Trust will use the Operational Plan to define the scope and seek suitably qualified people/organisations to tender for the work.

The Draft Operational Plan – Atticus Fleming Chief Executive AWC

Would the fence proposed eventually cover the whole area?

- The fenced area shown was meant to be a first stage. Following this, there would be a range of options that could be pursued and these would be dependant on the knowledge gained from the forthcoming research.

Why has AWC proposed a fence?

- AWC's experience has found that 90% of re-introductions will not work without a fence.

North Head is surrounded by water on 3 sides. Would it be possible to fence off the headland from Manly to eradicate ferals?

- This type of action would require joint cooperation between the significant landholders. The question of the fence is still under investigation.

How do you protect the animals without a fence?

- There are some small mammals which could be re-introduced without the need for a fence.

Will a fence skew the existing bandicoot population? Would a fence be required if you were not proposing re-introductions? Has the idea of preserving and protecting the headland been lost for want of re-introductions on the headland? There is an existing wall in the School of Artillery. If that wall were modified and repaired could it not serve as the barrier that is intended?

- The draft operational plan has so far provided a basis to get the process moving and allow us to work with other stakeholders. In two years we will be in better place to make an informed decision about the fence.

Why can't the cliff face be used a boundary on the eastern side?

- The fence is also proposed to exclude rats. The cliff face does not stop rats.

Has the Operational Plan been adopted?

- No it is currently in draft format. The draft was exhibited from 2 July 2007 to 27 July 2007 and submissions were invited.

Leasing

How would a function centre and accommodation impact on the Sanctuary for North Head?

- None of the uses are meant to be stand alone. The size of the buildings and spaces are also a self controlling measure for the intensity of uses on the site. It depends on how such facilities are operated. The Trust is seeking a range of uses that support and complement the sanctuary. Uses that enable people to become familiar with the sanctuary and enjoy the experience should be part of that mix.

What is the time frame for leasing?

- This will depend on the number of applications and how they fit with plans, with the sanctuary concept and with each other. We hope some of the leases would commence in 2008.

Would an artists in residency program be something that could be put forward as a proposal for leasing?

- Yes. All proposals require the details on how they would be put into place.

What specific information is required in the Request for Proposals (RFP) documentation?

- The RFP brochure sets out the process and requirements. The Trust's Property, Marketing and Management staff are available to discuss any queries about the RFP process and information requirements.

How are the leasing decisions made by the Trust?

- The Trust has a tenant Selection Committee which consists of 5 Directors. This committee makes decisions on the smaller leases. If the leasable area is beyond 500m² then the lease approval must go to the Trust's Board. Leases that go beyond the life of the Trust require the approval of the minister.

Does the CAC have a role in this?

- The CAC does not have a role in the decision making process. Leasing proposals are commercial in confidence. The CAC can and has offered suggestions on the selection criteria for leasing.

Are the selection criteria the same for all the Trust sites?

- Yes the general categories are, but they are considered differently according to the individual site's qualities.

Shouldn't the criteria for North Head be different given it is such a unique area?

- The criteria include "planned use" compatibility of proposals with heritage and environmental values and constraints. These are different for each site and in this case take into account the unique qualities of North Head. The Request for Proposal document is not intended to be read alone. Applicants are asked to read it in conjunction with the Management Plan for the School of Artillery which does goes into greater detail about the Sanctuary concept and all the other planning issues that need to be considered. The criteria reflect this.

Phil Jenkyn proposed a resolution that the life of the Harbour Trust should be extended.

There proposal was supported unanimously.

Presentation slides are attached.

Close of Meeting

The meeting concluded at 6.45 pm.