

## **6.7 Consultation - community**

Minutes of the Quarantine Station Consultative Committee meetings



## FINAL MINUTES

### Quarantine Station Community Committee - Meeting 50

Date: 29 May 2014, 10:00am– 12:30pm

Theme: Planning approval modifications proposal

#### 1. QSCC business matters

##### 1.1. Welcome and acknowledgment of country

Cathy Griffin acknowledged the traditional owners past and present.

**Attendance:** Cathy Griffin (elected Chairperson), Paul Lancaster, Doug Sewell, Fiona Shadbolt, Tim Lisle-Williams (guest), Max Player (MQS), Suzanne Stanton (MQS), Michael Treanor representing Peter Hay (NPWS), Paul Davies (heritage consultant), Michael Chilcott (planning consultant), Peter Todman (NPWS), Stuart Schramm (NPWS), Sue Elks (NPWS) and Siân Waythe (NPWS).

**Apologies:** Colin Rockcliff, Virginia Macleod (guest) and Peter Hay (NPWS).

Siân Waythe introduced Michael Chilcott (planning consultant), Paul Davies (heritage consultant), Michael Treanor (Harbour Area Manager, representing Peter Hay), Stuart Schramm (Director, Park Assets Branch) and Sue Elks (Team Leader, Planning and Assessment). Followed by introductions by all members and officers.

##### 1.2. Approval of the draft minutes

The draft minutes were approved without amendment.

##### 1.3. Review of outstanding actions

Siân Waythe provided a paper covering the status of all actions. Refer to action list in [Attachment 1](#). Only one action to report on. The letter from the Eco Divers' was disseminated to all QSCC members.

##### 1.4. Correspondence

Siân Waythe advised that the QSCC Chairperson received responses from OEH via Mike Baird MP and the Minister for the Environment regarding the requested extension of the QSCC's term to the full four years.

Siân Waythe and Stuart Schramm explained that all NPWS boards and committees are being reviewed by the NSW Cabinet. Siân Waythe assured the members that the QSCC is a mandatory requirement of the planning approval that the QSCC will continue. She will continue to pursue the matter with the Minister's Office and will advise the QSCC as soon as a decision is made.

##### 1.5. Status of Ministerial appointments

Siân Waythe advised that nominations for Tim Lisle-Williams and Virginia McLeod were with the Minister for the Environment.

## **2. Workshop on proposed modifications to the Quarantine Station planning approval**

Suzanne Stanton, Max Player, Paul Davies and Michael Chilcott explained the rationale for the proposed changes to the planning approval and outlined the format and content of the draft report (*Preliminary Environmental Overview in support of a s75W Modification Application – May 2014*). They outlined the four categories of conditions within the proposal: (a) satisfied conditions; (b) minor/catch up/administrative changes; (c) major changes; and (d) no change proposed. Suzanne Stanton advised the draft report is confidential at this stage.

Michael Chilcott outlined the planning process to prepare, assess and approve the modifications proposal.

1. PROPOSAL—2. SEEK SUPPORTING LETTERS ---3. APPLY TO DPE FOR DGR's --
4. REVISE PROPOSAL & UNDERTAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ---
5. SUBMIT APPLICATION TO DPE FOR ASSESSMENT & APPROVAL

Notes: DPE – Department of Planning and Environment  
DGR's – Director-General of the DPE requirements for environmental assessment.  
Community consultation may occur at various stages (2-5) of the process.

There was some discussion on whether the satisfied conditions should be removed or left in the revised planning approval. They will be left in as many have ongoing requirements.

Cathy Griffin noted that some of the proposed minor catch up changes are more than minor word changes. She also stated that the QSCC had only just received this report to review and that a second meeting would be required to consider further.

Comments received and responses to the proposed changes to co-proponency, air conditioning, spatial layout, building use, shade structures and special interest tours are listed in Attachment 2. A copy of the sheets recording workshop comments follows in Attachment 3.

## **3. Other business**

### **3.1. Community open day**

Suzanne Stanton and Siân Waythe advised on that the next community open day is Sunday 15 June 2014, 10am-2pm, 'Behind the scenes' theme. See how the historical buildings influence hotel management; meet the suppliers, dinner-to-die-for, etc.

### **3.2. Quarantine Station Lecture Series**

Siân Waythe and Paul Lancaster advised that the date for the next lectures is Sunday 15 June.

## **4. Next meeting details**

Siân Waythe will arrange a follow up workshop in June to consider the outstanding proposed changes.

**Action 3:** NPWS to confirm the date of the next QSCC modifications workshop.

## **5. Light lunch and refreshments**

The meeting concluded with a light lunch.

## Attachment 1 - QUARANTINE STATION COMMUNITY COMMITTEE MEETING ACTION LIST

### Actions arising from meeting No. 50 (29 May 2014)

No	Action	Lead	Due
1	NPWS & MQS to provide a table documenting lessor & landlord responsibilities under the planning approval and lease.	Siân Waythe & Suzanne Stanton	30 June 2014
2	NPWS to provide a copy of NPWS' line of business contacts.	Stuart Schramm	23 June 2014
3	NPWS to confirm the date of the next QSCC modifications workshop.	Siân Waythe	10 June 2014

### Actions arising from previous meetings

No	Action	Lead	Status
1	NPWS to provide Q Station teachers' kit and Ehive weblinks to QSCC.	Siân Waythe	Complete.
2	NPWS to confirm the date of the next QSCC meeting.	Siân Waythe	Complete.
4	MQS to provide Eco Diver's letter on damage to seagrass from recreational vessels to NPWS.	Suzanne Stanton	Complete. The letter was issued with Meeting 50 documentation.

## Attachment 2 – MODIFICATIONS PROPOSAL WORKSHOP FEEDBACK SUMMARY

QUESTIONS & ISSUES	RESPONSE	REFERENCE
UNDERSTANDING THE DRAFT PROPOSAL REPORT		
Document roadmap	NA	Page 4
Conditions satisfied and being implemented (ie no changes proposed).	NA	Page 15
Changes and proposals	NA	Page 46
Minor/catch up/ administrative changes	NA	Page 74
No proposed changes	NA	Page 92
REVIEW OF MAJOR CHANGES - 4.1 Co-proponency		
Are the conditions of consent in the lease?	Yes, word for word. There will be links throughout the document.	Section 4.1
Has NPWS sought independent legal advice?	Legal advice sought within NPWS at this stage. Independent advice was sought when the lease was drafted. The lease provides for a breach mechanism.	Section 4.1
What are the relationships not documented? Clarification of co-proponency is required?	Detail will be in the lease on roles & responsibilities, communication channels, etc.	Section 4.1
Identify responsibilities between lessor and lessee (particularly for natural and cultural heritage conservation)?	MQS/NPWS have a document that outlines the roles & responsibilities for each condition of approval. <b>This table will be made available to the QSCC (Action 1).</b> Generally natural conservation actions go to NPWS.	Section 4.1
Who is responsible for outside the lease area?	NPWS (Harbour Area) for on park and the various landholders on North Head. They may be accessed through the North Head Stakeholders Group. <b>Stuart Schramm can provide a copy of NPWS line of business contacts (Action 2).</b>	Section 4.1
What is the ongoing position of Environmental Manager and Heritage Officer? Further clarification of roles is required.	This will be clearly articulated, who this is & role defined. Looking at outcome-based approach.	Section 4.1
REVIEW OF MAJOR CHANGES - 4.2 Flexibility of use		
Build in balance of uses	Inherent in all documents & can be further articulated. No change to objectives. Proposed 'e' requires Mawland to put up change, NPWS to approve – must meet objectives.	Section 4.2

Conditions 21 and 22 relate to the Environmental Study Centre. Buildings P21 and P23 to provide student accommodation. How is this function going to be addressed. This function should not be lost.	See comment above. Problems with buildings in Third Class Precinct not meeting Dept of Education standards for student accommodation. Student accommodation is being provided elsewhere on site.	Section 4.2
Approval role for Heritage Officer (Advisor/architect)?	Paul Davies recommends solutions & <u>inspects construction works.</u> <u>There was discussion around roles &amp; responsibilities of the Heritage Advisor.</u>	Section 4.2
Is there a proposed change to condition 22?	No, remains as current consent & and in the lease. We could remove specific reference to buildings & maintain intent, reflect better in going forward, must also reflect current Dept of Education requirements. We can tidy up ambiguous clauses & review all clauses to reflect current & future use of buildings.	Section 4.2
Make new conditions to better reflect technology & current use for <u>school (primary &amp; secondary) and tertiary</u> educational purposes	We could make it a statement of intent.	Section 4.2
<b>REVIEW OF MINOR CHANGES - Special interest tours (Condition 134)</b>		
Condition 134 – will Parks Ecopass be required for tours?	No, not within the lease area. We can include word 'on site' into the new condition.	Page 82
What about third party tour operator access?	Mawland would be accountable, could be a sub-contractor under Mawland's control. No independent commercial operations, must get Mawland's approval under property rights. Delete any reference to Locations not within the lease area.	Page 82
Delete condition 134? What about NPWS' approval role?	Possible, need to address Aboriginal heritage tour requirements.	Page 82
<b>REVIEW OF MAJOR CHANGES - 4.3 Air conditioning</b>		
Is ducted air conditioning proposed?	Possibly in the Third Class Dining Room (P27) only, then only a small system and only on when needed.	Section 4.3
Will individual unit be individually controlled?	Yes, to modify temperature to mitigate extremes.	Section 4.3
How will you ensure compliance by clients?	ACCOR sustainability report. Advise clients, put on timer system, only activated by staff, many management options. Operational issue not factored into by consent conditions.	Section 4.3
Concern over sustainability with use of air conditioners. Eg hotel reception building has air conditioning on with doors open.	See above comment.	Section 4.3
How will you advise the community on this proposal?	Explain rationale, three tiered approach, as outlined by Paul Davies.	Section 4.3
Consider including kitchens in the list of rooms for air conditioning.	Can be included.	Section 4.3

What about visual and acoustic considerations?	Can be included.	Section 4.3
What about reversibility?	Can be included. There is a clear definition of reversibility, cross Reference to Burra Charter. Add definition to planning approval.	Section 4.3
<b>REVIEW OF MAJOR CHANGES - 4.6 Spatial layout (Buildings P1, P2 &amp; P9)</b>		
Has there been an independent fire engineering assessment?	Yes, no alternate to address ban on corridor access. BCA consultant will not sign off on alternate solutions. Fire suppression was dealt with by sprinklers.	Section 4.6
What is the intention for the corridors?	For P2 - convert into en-suites. For P1 – rooms rented to have an Exclusive use personal bathroom. Other rooms not to be rented.	Section 4.6
Will the internal facilities in Building P1 remain?	Yes.	Section 4.6
Is the proposal reversible?	Yes, original fabric remains, some changes to floors (holes for utilities).	Section 4.6
What about fulfilling the intention of sampling? Keep some buildings unchanged?		Section 4.6
Keep building common rooms	Paul Davies agreed that this was possible. <u>Max Player agree to consider retaining lounges in buildings P1 &amp; P2 for use as function or meeting rooms.</u>	Section 4.6
What is the outcome of the changed condition?	Reflect the current situation. Keep principle in wording.	Section 4.6
Include 'sampling' in the conditions? Provide a definition.	Flexibility for P1 not P2 for concept of common room.	Section 4.6
<b>REVIEW OF MAJOR CHANGES - 4.9 Use of shade structures</b>		
Include temporary in new condition and no advertising.	Yes, no third party advertising. Definition of temporary shade structure versus umbrellas. Shade structures or umbrellas not allowed adjacent to verandahs.	Section 4.9
Delete proposed approval role of Heritage Advisor.	Yes, replace with approving authority, eg lessor. Clarify approval authority.	Section 4.9
Concern over losing the original intent to provide an arrival experience similar to Quarantine Station detainees. How to regulate proliferation of umbrellas and shade structures?	Clarify principle – colour, notion of temporary defined, low visual impact, no advertising. Has to work operationally.	Section 4.9

1 REPORT

P4 ROADMAP

P15	<u>COND</u>	Satisfied & Conditions being implemented	<u>NO CHANGES</u>
-----	-------------	--	-------------------

P46 CHANGES & PROPOSALS CHANGES

P74	<u>MINOR / CATCH</u> <u>UPS</u>	{ eg DECC → OEH → DEC → Co-Prop →	MINOR ADMIN
-----	------------------------------------	--	-------------

P92 NO CHANGES → NO CHANGES

## 4.1 Co Proponent

(1)

### - Conditions of consent in lease?

Yes - word for word

There will be links throughout the document

### - NPWS sought independent legal advice?

Legal advice sought within NPWS at this stage. Independent advice sought when lease drafted  
Lease provides for breach mechanism

### - What are relationships - not documented?

Detail will be in the lease on roles + responsibilities, communication channels

### - Identify responsibilities between Lessor + Lessee?

(particularly for natural/heritage conservation)

Document prepared outlining roles + responsibilities

- audit tables - in current lease - will make available to committee  
conservation actions generally go to NPWS

### - Responsibilities outside lease area?

NPWS - North Head Stakeholder Group

- happy to answer any questions

Stuart can provide NPWS line of business info

### - Environmental manager - NPWS staff?

+ Heritage officer

Will be clearly articulated who this is + role defined - looking at outcome based

## 4.2 Flexibility of Use

(2)

- Build in balance of uses?

Inherent in all documents and can be further articulated. No change to objectives. Proposed "e" requires Mawland to put up change, NPLWS to approve - must meet objectives

- Approval role of Heritage Officer?

Recommendations of solutions

A pseudo "compliance" role

- Change to Clause 22?

No - remains as consent and in lease

Could remove specific reference to buildings + maintain intent - reflect better in going forward - must also reflect current Dept. Ed requirements - can tidy up ambiguous clauses - can review all clauses to reflect current + future use of buildings

\* Make new conditions to better reflect technology + current use for educational purposes - Could make it a statement on intent

3  
Clause 134 - require ParksEcoPass for  
tours? (Pg 82)

No - not within lease area

Can include words "on site" into clause

3rd party tour operator access?

Mawland accountable - could be subcontractor  
under Mawland - no independent commercial  
operations - must get Mawland approval - under  
property rights - delete any reference to locations  
not on 'site'.

Clause 139 - delete? NPWS approval role?

Possible - need to address Aboriginal heritage  
tour requirements

## 4.3 Air Conditioning

(4)

### - Ducted air conditioning?

3rd class dining room only - small system - only on when needed

### - Individual units individually controlled?

Yes - modify temperature to mitigate extremes

### - Ensure compliance by clients?

ACCOR sustainability report

Advise clients - put on timer system - only activated by staff - many management options.

Operational issue - not factored into consent conditions

### - Advice to community?

Explain rationale - 3 tiered approach as outlined by Paul

### - Kitchens? Visual/acoustic considerations?

Can be included

### - Reversability?

Can be included - definition - cross reference to BURRA charter

## 4.6 Spatial layout P1, P2, P9

(5)

- Independent fire engineer assessment?  
Yes - not alternate to corridors  
BCA consultant will not sign off
- Intention for corridors?  
Convert to ensuites  
Rooms rented have an external bathroom for  
exclusive use - other rooms not rented
- P1 external facilities remain?  
Yes
- Reversible?  
Yes - original fabric remains - some changes to floors (holes  
for utilities)
- Fulfilling the intention of sampling? Keep something  
unchanged?  
Lost already - door sealed, corridors separated
- \* Keep building common rooms?  
Possible (Paul)  
Will not have lounge area in these buildings - not  
operational - P6 reading room, P5 lounge room, but in  
isolation area is a lounge
- Outcome of changed condition?  
Reflect current situation - keep principal in wording
- Include 'sampling' in condition? defined  
Flexibility for P1 not P2 for concept of common room

## 4.9 Use of shade structures

6

- temporary in clause? no advertising?

Yes - no 3rd party advertising

Definition of temporary shade structure vs. umbrellas

Not allowed adjacent to verandahs

- Delete approval role of Heritage Officer?

Yes - by approving authority eg lessor - clarity approval authority

- Lose original intent - 1st arrival experience? how to regulate proliferation?

Clarify principal: colour, notion of temporary defined, low visual impact, no advertising

Has to work operationally