

## **Quarantine Station**

### **North Head Manly**

#### **Section 75W Modifications Application MP08-0041 MOD3**

#### **Responses to Submissions and Correspondence from Planning**

**September 2017**



## CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED AND RESPONSE .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>WORDING OF VARIATIONS TO EXISTING CONDITIONS.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>43</b>

## FIGURES

- 1 Map of the Quarantine Station

## APPENDIXES

- A Planning Letter dated 14 March 2016
- B Letters from Heritage Council of NSW dated 2 March 2017 and 20 April 2017 with attachment
- C Email from Carla Ganassin, Fisheries NSW dated 6 April 2017
- D Email from David Pavlich, Roads and Maritime Services dated 3 July 2017

- E** Emails from Nicholas Carlile, Acting Primary Scientist, Office of Environment & Heritage dated 3 July 2017 and 26 July 2017
- F** Report from Paul Davies Pty Ltd regarding Shade Structures dated February 2015
- G** Biosis Report dated 9 February 2015
- H** Letter from Paul Davies dated 21 April 2016
- I** Reports from GTA Consultants dated 21 June 2017 and 22 August 2017
- J** Sydney Morning Herald article by Melanie Kembrey dated 14 March 2016
- K** Office of Environment & Heritage Quarantine Station Community Committee – Meeting 50 – 29 May 2014
- L** Letter from Jamie Lonie, Sydney Harbour Federation Trust dated 29 February 2016
- M** Letter from Stephen Clements, Manly Council dated 1 March 2016
- N** Environmental Audit – December 2011 – Executive Summary
- O** Letter from National Parks and Wildlife Service dated 25 September 2014
- P** Letter from Wilkinson Murray dated 29 October 2015
- Q** Letter from NSW Planning and Environment dated 28 April 2016
- R** Letter from Mawland to NSW Planning and Environment dated 4 July 2017

# 1 INTRODUCTION

The ten-year anniversary of the execution of the Quarantine Station (Q Station) Lease arising from the Conditions of Planning Approval (CoPA) has recently passed. Since the issuing of that approval, the site has moved from establishment phase to operation phase. Inevitably, and based on the experience gathered across that decade, there are a number of conditions that warrant review and modification. Any such modifications require that a formal application be made to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) for modification of the consent under s 75W of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (NSW) ('EP&A').

This document has been prepared in support of the application for Modification of the CoPA at the request of the Department of Planning and is adjunct to the three volume Environmental Assessment Report lodged in August 2015, and the various submissions and correspondence received by Mawland, The Department of Planning and NPWS as part of their consultation with the local community and other government stakeholders. Mawland and NPWS identified ten (10) areas of the existing CoPA for amendment. These proposals for substantive CoPA amendment, while not impacting on the objectives of the Q Station approval, would improve the operation of the Q Station from this point.

The Modifications are proposed by Mawland, with the support of NSW NPWS. They include replacement of the co-proponent status of NPWS and Mawland with wording to reflect the current relationship of the two entities as lessor and lessee.

The CoPA proposed for amendment relates to the following areas:

1. Co-proponency
2. Urban design and visual
  - a. Use of shade structures
3. Heritage
  - a. Air conditioning
  - b. Spatial Layout (Building P1, P2 and P9)
  - c. Flexibility and balance of use
4. Noise
  - a. Outdoor music
5. Environmental management
  - a. Environment audit cycle
  - b. Site wide plans review
  - c. Bandicoot triggers
  - d. Site visitor capacity

For convenience, Mawland has also reviewed all other existing CoPA with the NSW NPWS and has identified those CoPA requiring **administrative amendment** to reflect changed administrative arrangements within Government.

Finally, it is proposed that the remaining CoPA remain unchanged. A number of these are identified in the Environmental Assessment as having been **satisfied**, while others remain subject to unchanged ongoing implementation at the Q Station.

## 2 BACKGROUND

The Quarantine Station (Q Station) is located on North Head, Manly, and within the Sydney Harbour National Park, some 10km to the north east of the Sydney CBD. The 36 Ha of Q Station is owned by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) [National Parks and Wildlife Service], and is managed under a long term lease by the Mawland Group. A map of the Q Station, illustrating its lease boundaries and locations of key buildings, is provided (see **Figure 1**).

The site was used as a Quarantine Station from 1833 to 1984. Due to its unique natural and heritage values the site was included as part of Sydney Harbour National Park.

On 16 March 1984, ownership of the Q Station was transferred from the Commonwealth to the State Government and was reserved as part of Sydney Harbour National Park. The National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) established guided tours and a Conference and Functions Centre on the site.

Maintaining the Q Station grounds and buildings has always been a challenge. Despite considerable work by the NPWS over the first 10 years of its management as a national park, many of the buildings and some of the cultural landscape surrounding them fell into disrepair. By 2006 aspects of the site required immediate conservation and/or upgrading.

As a consequence, the NSW NPWS decided that a partnership with an appropriate private sector operator could secure the funding required for the site's repair and on-going conservation. Approval for the proposed conservation and adaptive re-use of the Quarantine Station at North Head, including the leasing of the site by NPWS to Mawland, was granted in 2003. The lease was signed in 2006.

The site's natural, and Aboriginal and European cultural, heritage features have been documented at length in the original environmental assessment of the proposed "Conservation and Adaptive Re-use of the North Head Quarantine Station" prepared in 2001 (Manidis Roberts Consultants, 2001). Since the assessment, these features have remained largely unchanged with the exception of the changes made in relation to the implementation of the approved project when the lease was signed in 2006.

Some key features of the Quarantine Station include:

- Records of significant Aboriginal sites in various locations within the Q Station site,
- Significant European heritage items including buildings, cemeteries, and rock inscriptions associated with the site's use as a quarantine station,
- The presence of long nosed bandicoots, *Perameles nasuta*, comprising part of the endangered North Head population of this species,
- The presence of Little Penguins, *Eudyptula minor*, comprising part of the endangered population of this species at Manly,  
The presence of rare and endangered flora on the site including stands of endangered Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub and the endangered species *Acacia terminalis ssp terminalis*.

Of the modifications to existing conditions of consent contained in this proposal to the DPE, only one, relating to the proposed approval of ambient outdoor dining music, has any potential for impact on any of these significant natural and heritage features. This is addressed within the document and includes more detailed descriptions of the relevant natural environment features of concern. T As other features remain unaffected by the proposal detailed descriptions beyond reference to previous documentation are not provided in this report.



## Legend & map reference

	Map Ref A6	Q Station Entrance; Reception & Car Park
	Building P11 Map Ref B3	Views Restaurant; Breakfast
	Building A6 Map Ref C2	Boilerhouse Restaurant & Engine Room Lounge; A la carte Menu & Casual Dining
	Map Ref D1	Luggage Store Visitor Centre & Cafe; Free History Exhibition 10-4pm
	Inside Luggage Store Visitor Centre Map Ref D1	Tours Desk; Ghost & History Tours, Kayaking, Snorkelling & Beach Towels
	Building P5 Map Ref C3 Building P6 Map Ref C3 Building A28 Map ref C3	Guest Lounges; Coffee Machine (P5) Books (P6) Games (A28)
	Map ref B2, B3, C1, D1, E2, F3	Point of Interest, Heritage Building or View
	Map Ref A6, B3, C3, D1, D3, E2, E4	Bus Stop (or dial Ext 9)
	Map Ref B3, C3, D1, D2, F3	Guest Smoking Area
	Map Ref B3, D2, D3, E3	Emergency Muster Points
		Accommodation Buildings
		Tour Buildings
		Function Rooms

Figure 1: Map of the Quarantine Station

### **3 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT**

This report has been prepared in response to submissions received following public exhibition of the proposal.



## 4 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

Submissions were received from:

- Department of Planning and Environment dated 28 April 2016 and 14 March 2016
- NSW Heritage Council dated 29 February 2016
- Sydney Harbour Federation Trust dated 29 February 2016
- Manly Council dated 1 March 2016
- OEH Regional Operations NPWS dated 4 March 2016
- Ann Sharp undated
- Chris Diaz undated
- Jacqueline French undated
- Jane Hilton undated
- Manly Resident Anon 1 dated 29 February 2016
- Manly Resident Anon 2 undated, blue ink
- Name Withheld 1
- Name Withheld 2
- Name Withheld 3
- Douglas Sewell dated 29 February 2016
- Mary Johnsen undated

In addition, an article published in the Sydney Morning Herald dated 14 March was addressed.

For completeness, we have also extracted NPWS' comments on the OEH Regional Letter, referred to above.

The table below provides a summary of the submissions received and Mawland's response to the submissions.

Where further elaboration to the response is required, an attachment is included.

## 5 SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED AND RESPONSE

Matters raised by Planning and the Submissions can be grouped under the following summary of headings:

- Other necessary approvals
- Site Plan/Flexibility of Uses
- Tours
- Jenner and Ferries
- Co-Proponency
- Umbrellas, Windbreaks and Shade Structures
- Penguins/Outdoor Amplified Music (including clarification of music not adjacent to critical habitat)
- Cooling and Heating
- P1, P2 and P9 Spatial Layout
- Visitor Capacity
- Cultural Heritage Issues
- Environmental audit cycle timing and site wide plan review  
Bandicoot Mortality responsibility rationalisation

Responses to each appear in the column headed “Mawland Comments”. The first part of the table deals with the Government submissions and thereafter we deal with the public submissions. Where amendments to proposals in the Main Report are suggested by Mawland in response to the Submissions, these are noted in the third column below.

## 6 COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

<p><b>Respondent Name /Reference</b></p> <p><u>Note:</u> If more than one respondent has made a submission on an issue all names are shown.</p>	<p><b>Issue Raised</b></p>	<p><b>Mawland Comment</b></p>
<p>NSW Planning and Environment Letter dated 14 March 2016 ('Planning'))(see <b>Appendix A</b>) Page 1, Para 4</p>	<p>Requirement to obtain other necessary approvals</p>	<p>The “necessary approvals” referred to in the fourth paragraph have been obtained from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OEH/Heritage (see <b>Appendix B</b>), detailing Heritage Council Approvals dated 2 March 2017 and 20 April 2017 to which plans are appended, dealing with Shade Structures and Bathrooms;</li> <li>• Fisheries (see <b>Appendix C</b>), comprising an email from Carla Ganassian at Fisheries dated 6 April 2017 confirming that DPI Fisheries is satisfied with the proposed amendments;</li> <li>• RMS (see <b>Appendix D</b>), comprising an email from David Pavlich dated 3 July 2017 at Roads and Maritime Services confirming that RMS has no objection to the proposed shade structure in the wharf precinct adjacent to RMS property and noting that additional movements are not forecast or anticipated as an outcome of the proposed modification, and;</li> <li>• NPWS (see <b>Appendix E</b>), comprising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An email from Nicholas Carlile, Acting Principal Scientist of OEH, dated 3 July 2017, confirming that the proposed shade structures will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins; and</li> <li>○ An email from Nicholas Carlile, Acting Principal Scientist of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		OEH, dated 26 July 2017, confirming that the proposed daylight amplified music/announcements at Open Days will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins.
Planning Page 2(1)	Site Plan to be submitted detailing locations, names and uses of each building associated with the original approval	<p>See <b>Figure 1</b></p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hotel accommodation/Functions/Events/Education/Restaurants operate as Q Station</li> <li>• Visitors Centre/Tours/Storytelling and Interpretation operate as QQ Station</li> <li>• S1 and S2 now operate as accommodation by internal agreement with NPWS</li> <li>• Original approval provided for a Health Retreat to be located under P5, but this was not picked up in the coloured plan (see Conditions).</li> <li>• H1 now operates for Functions/Conferencing/Education due to failure of Defiance Production</li> <li>• A28-29 is used as a public guest lounge and educational/heritage displays</li> </ul>
Planning page 2(2)	Condition 134 – Special Interest Tours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning’s comment is noted. Mawland needs to be able to operate our tours and education offerings in accordance with the current NPWS guidelines from time to time. The proposed amendment grants flexibility on-site as our products become tired or require more sophistication, particularly for returning visitors. All that is sought here is an ability to change tour products and content to meet market demand and in particular new information about the site gained from the University of Sydney Stories from the Sandstone Project.</li> <li>• There is no intention to operate indigenous tours without approval</li> </ul>

		<p>of NPWS and the relevant indigenous channels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliance with NPWS is already ensured through our Visitor Access Strategy and Interpretation Plan.</li> <li>• The modification requested is obviously confined to the leased area because NPWS approval is still required for Mawland (or indeed any other person or group, to visit Cannae Point/Store Beach or anywhere else on the Headland.</li> <li>• On a number of occasions NPWS operatives have informally notified Mawland that commercially run nature tours by Third Parties would not be permitted on site. Commercial tours by Third Parties are allowed elsewhere on North Head. We are loathe to agree to a monopoly on nature tours by NPWS in a climate where, to date, NPWS have been unable or unwilling to provide regular tour experiences. We have no current plans to operate Third Party Nature Tours, and, in the event that we do operate nature tours in the future, we would give NPWS every opportunity to operate the tours before engaging a third party.</li> </ul>
Planning Page 2(3)	Condition 140/141 - The Jenner and Ferries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite expending significant funds, the Jenner sank some years ago while being repaired and is not operable. In any event, notwithstanding the prescriptive nature of the original Conditions, RMS regulations did not ever permit operation of the Jenner in this rough water area.</li> <li>• The requested Modification to Condition 140 has been withdrawn and Mawland will make application to RMS for Ferry use in accordance with Condition 141 at a later date.</li> </ul>
Planning Page 2(4)	Co-Proponency	Mawland accepts Planning's comments.

Planning Page 2(5)	Plans A6 - Shade Structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of location of the Shade Structures are clearly marked on the Heritage Council Approval dated 20 April 2017 (see <b>Appendix B</b>).</li> <li>• See also the email from Nicholas Carlile, Acting Principal Scientist at OEH dated 3 July 2017 confirming that the proposed shade structures will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins (see <b>Appendix E</b>).</li> <li>• As regards the Environmental Impact of the use of the shade structures, we have attached commentary from our original application, (see <b>Appendix F</b>) and commentary from Fisheries, RMS, NPWS, Heritage (by virtue of their Approval) (see <b>Appendices B-E</b>) and our Heritage Architect that these structures will not create environmental impact.</li> </ul>
Planning page 2(6)	Windbreaks	Windbreaks will not be used and this requested Modification is withdrawn
Planning page 2(7)	Schedule 3	The words in issue are identical to the original words but have been moved lower down on the page to relate to both the shade structure and table umbrella for more abundant clarity.
Planning page 2(8)	Biosis Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mawland will accept limitation on music to daylight hours.</li> <li>• See Biosis Report (<b>Appendix G</b>). Note this is an updated report to that contained in the original Environmental Assessment Volume 2): <i>"...It is considered unlikely that the proposed modification to Condition 201 (introduction of limited amplified music) will result in any adverse impacts on Little Penguins at the North Head Quarantine Station."</i></li> <li>• See also the letter from NPWS (N Carlile) dated 26 July 2017 (<b>Appendix E</b>).</li> </ul>

Planning page 2(9)	Cooling and Heating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First, Mawland confirms that it too considers use of heavy duty, industrial air-conditioning inappropriate for this site. This information has been provided to Heritage and Heritage Consent to Air Conditioning in nominated areas of the site is attached for confirmation by Planning (See <b>Appendix B</b>).</li> <li>• Installation of air-conditioning in ceiling space/under floor will only be done with the approval of the Heritage Architect and relevant authorities, subject to protection of fabric (and all other relevant conditions) at all times. Generally, air-conditioning will be made available through stand alone, plug in units in each room. Air Conditioning is shown as an Approved Development in Heritage's letter dated 2 March 2017 (see <b>Appendix B</b>), and the concerns raised are dealt with in points 3-5 of the letter:</li> </ul> <p><i>"EXCEPT AS AMENDED by the conditions of this approval:</i></p> <p><i>...3. Air-conditioning General: The reticulation for new air-conditioning works should not be chased into original fabric. External units should not be visible from the public domain.</i></p> <p><i>...4. Air-condition in Building P27: No structural elements of the floors are to be removed. The original flood boards removed for the installation of the floor vents are to be retained, documented and stored. They are to be removed in a way which makes future reinstatement possible.</i></p> <p><i>...5. Air-conditioning in Building S7: The compressor unit for the air-conditioning in Building S7 should be relocated to the building under-croft to reduce the visual impact."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your concerns are generally dealt with in Heritage's approval of the systems proposed by Mawland.</li> </ul>
--------------------	---------------------	--

Planning page 3(10)	Ceiling Fans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mawland has undertaken to NPWS and the Community Group that there will be no installation of air-conditioning in accommodation rooms and ceiling fans are used in accommodation rooms.</li> <li>• Installation of any additional ceiling fans would be governed by the last margin dot point (p 28 Main Report) because ceiling fans are included in the definition of the words “appropriate contemporary technology for heating and cooling” in the first margin dot point.</li> <li>• The Community Committee has no objection to use of ceiling fans in accommodation rooms.</li> </ul>
Planning page 3(11)	P1,P2 and P9 Spatial Layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This information has been provided to Heritage and Planning and is the subject of the attached Heritage Consent (see <b>Appendix B</b>) These final approvals relate to P1 and P2 only. We confirm that the reference to P9 in this context was because P9 was included in the original heading relating to P1 and P2. We confirm formally that no modifications are proposed to the internal layout of Building P9. This has also been confirmed in the Letter by Paul Davies, Heritage Architect dated 21 April 2016 (see <b>Appendix H</b>):  <i>“...There are no works proposed to P9 as part of the modification proposal... We recommend that the error in the request be corrected or that it is acknowledged that the condition is not valid in relation [sic] Building P9.”</i></li> </ul>



Planning page 3(12)	Visitor Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please see commentary and proposed Condition 120, p 56 Main Report.</li> <li>• These procedures need to remain adaptive and flexible on a case by case basis with cooperation by NPWS/Police etc. Currently, this can be seen on Boxing Day, New Year's Eve and Open Days, dependent on numbers (actual and anticipated), weather, special public transport if any etc.</li> <li>• See Traffic and Transport Impact Assessments prepared by GTA Consultants dated 21 June 2017 and 22 August 2017 (<b>Appendix I</b>). These Assessments address the issue of proposed increased in visitor numbers from 450 to 600 for pre-planned events of up to six hours on up to 20 occasions per year in accordance with the application previously provided.</li> </ul> <p><u>Car Parking Impact</u>  <i>"By implementing the proposed management measures, it is concluded that increasing the maximum capacity of Q Station from 450 to 600 people for pre-planned events for a period of up to six hours would not be expected to cause any adverse effects to the current car parking supply...The impact to the public bus network and the hop-on, hop-off ferry service is expected to increase, however the impact is expected to be minimal."</i></p> <p><u>Traffic Impact</u>  <i>"[The] anticipated increase in traffic is considered negligible and could not be expected to affect the safety or operation of the surrounding road network."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We note that Mawland has already agreed to submit procedures for vehicle management to NPWS (p 56 Volume 1 Environmental Assessment Main Report Linchpin)</li> </ul>
---------------------	------------------	---

<p>SMH Article Melanie Kembrey, 14 March 2016 (see <b>Appendix J</b>)</p>	<p>Music/Penguins</p>	<p>Mawland has been operating Q Station for over 8 years as a hotel, conference centre, wedding centre and as a site for educational and other tours. During this time, there has been no complaint concerning noise management at any part of the site, as distinct for example the Store Beach or the Trust Land. Mawland would however like to address several issues raised in the SMH Article by Melanie Kembrey dated 14 March 2016 which was annexed to Mawland's responses to Submissions. <b>This article was not a submission to Planning, but as it raised a number of issues concerning mis-information given to the public by advocate groups, we have chosen to address the letter's contents here.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attention is specifically drawn to the email from Nicholas Carlile dated 26 July 2017, Acting Principal Scientist, OEH confirming that the proposed daylight amplified music/announcements at Open Days will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins, refuting the allegations made by Ms Kembrey (see <b>Appendix E</b>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>"...The amplified music during daylight hours would not impact the Little Penguins breeding at the Pump House. Similarly, amplified addressing of groups at the Open Days would also be of little impact."</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• In particular, Mawland disputes the journalist's statement that the Little Penguin Colony is at risk by virtue of our modifications application and would request that Planning note both the terms of the Report annexed to the modifications application, and the support of the Q Station Community Group for these changes to the original Conditions of Approval (see <b>Appendix K</b>)</li> <li>• We refute the statement made in the article by Dr Lambert that the co-proponency changes would leave the penguins "in the hands of a company that runs for profit with no environmental expertise". Clearly Mawland will have no control over actual penguin management beyond following any instructions from NPWS. We have shown in the past our willingness to assist in</li> </ul>
---	-----------------------	--

		<p>protection of the colony and are distressed by any allegation otherwise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have requested NPWS assistance in assuring that this matter is not blown out of proportion. We assure you that this request was not indicative of any intention to run concerts or dances in the area, or in any way cause problems for the penguin community which we value and respect. Our aim is to show the site to the NSW public to its best advantage, and allow public enjoyment of this valuable site.</li> </ul>
<p>NPWS Commentary on NPWS Regional Letter dated 4 March 2016 from David Trewin to Chris Ritchie @Planning - as already sent to Peter McManus by Stuart Schramm (Director Park Assets NPWS) by email dated 18 March 2016.</p>	<p>(Email from Schramm NPWS to McManus extracted)</p> <p><i>In substance we (NPWS) support the content and letter from David Trewin dated 4/3/2016</i></p> <p><i>Key areas for consideration and possible requests for clarification from Mawland are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Numbers on site – we are ok with the increase of numbers however note that they will not be concentrated in any one area. The key concern for Mawland is the ability to have the hotel full and also have a wedding for example. The modification may be conditioned around numbers near the critical penguin habitat</i></li> </ul>	<p>Mawland – Noted and Agreed</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <i>Amplified music – we understand from the community consultation day Mawland is only really seeking to allow “Here comes the bride” as a bride walks down the wharf. Planning may seek confirmation of this. OEH Regional Operations has provided feedback on the proposal. It is a general community expectation to have ambient background music while dining. Planning may adopt measures outlined in the Regional Operations response.</i></li> <li>· <i>Co-proponency – NPWS has motivated this modification to ensure clarity. NPWS’ position is as follows: With the site now fully operational, with building and adaptive reuse works substantially complete, the proposed removal of co-proponency references will better reflect the lessor/lessee responsibilities at the Q Station. Under the proposal, the NPWS will retain statutory responsibility for all cultural and environmental management issues and Mawland would retain responsibility under its lease for operation of the Q Station facility. Separating the co-proponency allows NPWS to take on the appropriate role of Lessor and Mawland as Lessee that is responsible for the operation of the site.</i></li> <li>· <i>Umbrellas – NPWS requires no third party advertising and placement and colours</i></li> </ul>	<p>See Mawland Comments under heading 'Music/Penguin' above. Attention is specifically drawn to the email from Nicholas Carlile dated 26 July 2017, Acting Principal Scientist, OEH confirming that the proposed daylight amplified music/announcements at Open Days will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins (see <b>Appendix E</b>)</p> <p>Mawland - Noted</p>
--	---	---

	<p><i>sensitive to surroundings. We note the need for shelter and protection from the elements. Also suggest removable but adequately secured when up from wind for safety.</i></p>	Mawland – Noted and Already Agreed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <i>Heritage and Environmental Management – This function should be responsibility based rather than a specific position. This responsibility rests with our Park Management Branch – Metro North East Region that is regularly on site</i></li> </ul>	Mawland - Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <i>Adaptation of P1, P2 and P9. Sampling requirement has not resulted in interpretation of these buildings. Corridors required to be retained are locked off due to fire code. Installation of bathrooms in corridors, if capable of being reversible (noting they may likely never be reversed), are generally acceptable subject to a means of interpretation being in effect. E.g. building plans, signage, photos.</i></li> </ul>	Mawland - Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <i>Air-conditioning – subject to being reversible (noting they may likely never be reversed) it is a general contemporary need for use. Require details from heritage architect for mitigation of heritage and visual impact of installation – including outside elements and noise impacts.</i></li> </ul>	Mawland – Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <i>Bandicoots – due to the increase in activity</i></li> </ul>	

	<p><i>on the headland, outside of the Mawland lease area and Mawland's control, it is not appropriate to have triggers for Mawland's lease not within its control. The area needs to be adjusted and trigger number considered. Regional Operations has addressed this in its response.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Annual Environmental Report – provided the intent of the existing reporting regime is maintained, and the lessee maintains responsibility for undertaking the reporting, NPWS is supportive.</i></li> <li><i>Reporting frequency, plans and reviews – NPWS will consider reporting outcomes in its acceptance or otherwise of the options under the lease. Planning may wish to condition the modifications appropriately.</i></li> <li><i>Wharf – NPWS is to commence discussions with RMS to return the wharf to RMS control. Whilst this has not occurred and we are uncertain of the outcome, NPWS will be working closely with RMS to ensure operational requirements are consistent.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>It is understood that DPE will consider heritage implications in its deliberations and consult with appropriate bodies. (END Stuart Schramm email)</i></p>	<p>Mawland – Noted. See also Mawland Comments under heading 'Bandicoots' below</p> <p>Mawland – Noted</p> <p>Mawland – Noted</p>
--	--	--

<p>OEH/ NPWS Regional Letter dated 4 March 2016 from David Trewin to Chris Ritchie @Planning</p>		<p>Mawland notes that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C120 Recommendation of Trewin is acceptable.</li> <li>• C134 Recommendation of Trewin is acceptable</li> <li>• C168 Recommendation of Trewin is acceptable although Mawland notes it did not request Modification of this Condition and that is already covered off in C168.</li> <li>• C171 Recommendation of Trewin is acceptable provided funding request is reasonable. Mawland already makes significant contribution to the Site Environmental Levy, which should cover costs to undertake this task</li> <li>• Sch 5 Recommendation of Trewin is acceptable although Mawland notes it did not request Modification of this Condition and that is already covered off in C168.</li> <li>• C169A Recommendation of Trewin is acceptable and discussions as to the design of the sign are already in place with NPWS</li> <li>• C177 Recommendation of Trewin is acceptable</li> <li>• C177A Attention is specifically drawn to the email from Nicholas Carlile dated 26 July 2017, Acting Principal Scientist, OEH confirming that the proposed daylight amplified music/announcements at Open Days will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins (See <b>Appendix E</b>). Mawland will continue discussions with NPWS about this area and follow penguin habitat need directions of NPWS.</li> <li>• C180 Not agreed - Mawland already makes significant contribution to the Site Environmental Levy, which should cover costs to undertake this task.</li> <li>• C181 Recommendation of Trewin is acceptable even though modification of this condition was not requested by Mawland.</li> <li>• #C210 (b) This suggestion by Trewin goes beyond what Mawland is now requesting and Mawland would be happy to accept this proposal #</li> <li>• C201(c) Recommendation of Trewin is acceptable</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C201(d) Not agreed - Mawland already makes significant contribution to the Site Environmental Levy, which should cover costs to undertake this task.</li> <li>• C201(e) Discussions on this point are in progress between NPWS and Mawland. This suggestion is unworkable and a 1.5-1.8m fence is already in place, surrounded by vegetative screening and a roped off area.</li> <li>• C221(b) Recommendation of Trewin is acceptable</li> </ul>
Planning Request by Telephone	Amplified Music Traffic and Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attention is specifically drawn to the email from Nicholas Carlile dated 26 July 2017, Acting Principal Scientist, OEH confirming that the proposed daylight amplified music/announcements at Open Days will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins (see <b>Appendix E</b>).</li> <li>• Traffic and Transport Impact Assessments dated 20 June 2017 and 22 August 2017 prepared by GTA Consultants, (see <b>Appendix I</b>) addresses the issue of proposed increase in visitor numbers from 450 to 600 for pre-planned events of up to six hours on up to 20 occasions per year in accordance with the application previously provided. We note that Mawland has already agreed to submit procedures for vehicle management to NPWS (p 56 Volume 1 Environmental Assessment Main Report Linchpin)</li> </ul>
Heritage Council Submission - Rajeev Maini dated 29 February 2016	P1, P2 and P9 Co-Proponency Air-conditioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The matters discussed in this submission have been resolved between Mawland and Heritage and have resulted in the Heritage Approvals attached (see <b>Appendix B</b>).</li> </ul>



Letter from Sydney Harbour Federation Trust dated 29 February 2016 (see <b>Appendix L</b> )		No comment is required by Mawland on this letter of support beside our gratitude to our fellow North Head Stakeholder for support and ongoing cooperation, particularly as regards traffic issues and its recommendation concerning the provision of additional buses as part of the North Head Strategy.
Letter from Manly Council dated 1 March 2016 (see <b>Appendix M</b> )		No comment is required by Mawland on this letter of support beside our gratitude to our fellow North Head Stakeholder for support and ongoing cooperation, particularly concerning environmental management and mitigation.
Ann Sharp Jacqueline French Jane Hilton Douglas Sewell Mary Johnsen	Co-Proponency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPWS has motivated this modification to ensure clarity. NPWS' position is extracted above.</li> <li>• We contend that this modification is not weakening the Conditions and will not have adverse site impact. Indeed, Mawland needs NPWS to vigorously manage the environment, bush fire issues, flora, fauna and critical habitats.</li> <li>• It is for the NSW NPWS to determine the day-to-day operations and staffing which is possible given its budgetary constraints and obligations state-wide. Mr Schramm of NPWS may like to comment directly to Planning as to the proposed method of fulfilling the operational requirements of the Environmental Manager proposed by the original Conditions in the current government climate.</li> </ul>

<p>Ann Sharp Jacqueline French Anon Manly resident 1 and 2 Douglas Sewell</p>	<p>Visitor Capacity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic and Transport Impact Assessments dated 20 June 2017 and 22 August 2017 prepared by GTA Consultants (see <b>Appendix I</b>) addresses the issue of proposed increase in visitor numbers from 450 to 600 for pre-planned events of up to six hours on up to 20 occasions per year in accordance with the application previously provided. We note that Mawland has already agreed to submit procedures for vehicle management to NPWS (p 56 Volume 1 Environmental Assessment Main Report Linchpin)Please see commentary around, and proposed Condition 120, p 54 Main Report. Traffic procedures need to remain adaptive and flexible on a case by case basis with cooperation by NPWS/Police etc. Currently, this can be seen on Boxing Day, New Year’s Eve and Open Days, dependent on numbers (actual and anticipated) , weather, special public transport if any etc. Mawland would have no issue with imposing a reasonable time frame prior to an event in which it needs to give notice to NPWS.</li> <li>• NPWS has commented <i>above “we are ok with the increase of numbers however note that they will not be concentrated in any one area. The key concern for Mawland is the ability to have the hotel full and also have a wedding for example. The modification may be conditioned around numbers near the critical penguin habitat.” This is accepted by Mawland.</i> This specifically addresses the concern of Anon Resident 2 and Mr Sewell. We note that operationally the area adjacent to the critical habitat is necessarily limited, and Mawland would accept a limit of 150 persons on the Boilerhouse Terrace area at any one time.</li> <li>• Mawland has been operating on this site for over 8 years. In that time, we have not received Notice of any breach of Conditions of Approval. We have demonstrated excellent management of the site’s environmental and cultural heritage</li> </ul>
---	-------------------------	---

		<p>as evidenced by many awards, among them the NSW Government Award for Adaptive Re-Use and the SKAL International Prize (twice) for sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments which suggest that the cultural value of this site has been ignored are disingenuous, having regard to the funds expended and passion shown by Mawland for the heritage of this site.</li> <li>• Similarly, it is commercially unworkable to require all functions at the Boilerhouse area to be indoors (as suggested by Resident 2) and opposes the original intent of the Conditions of Approval for outdoor space usage.</li> <li>• Mawland stands by the Expert Report in Volume 3 and the increased call for use and interpretation of this site by increasing numbers of guests and student excursion visitors.</li> <li>• Awareness of the site is growing in the community and the request to increase the availability of the site to about 150 additional people on 14 additional occasions per year (6 already being approved) is a response to calls from all over Sydney to visit this iconic site. Mawland, and no doubt the NSW State Government, does not wish to deny people this opportunity to experience the Quarantine Station.</li> <li>• Attention is drawn to the email from Nicholas Carlile dated 3 July 2017, Acting Principal Scientist, OEH confirming that the proposed shade structures will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins and the email from Nicholas Carlile dated 26 July 2017, Acting Principal Scientist, OEH confirming that the proposed daylight amplified music/announcements at Open Days will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins (see <b>Appendix E</b>).</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<p>Chris Diaz Jacqueline French Jane Hilton Anon Manly resident 1 and 2 Name Withheld 1,2 and 3 Douglas Sewell Mary Johnsen</p>	<p>Music/Penguins</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See especially proposed C201(b) proposed by NPWS Regional Office concerning mitigative measures. Mr Sewell also offers acceptable mitigative measures.</li> <li>• Whether or not these residents consider outdoor music should be available to our guests is not relevant, provided that, if Planning decides music is acceptable, appropriate controls are in place to safeguard residents (water carriage of noise) and penguins.</li> <li>• It is important to remember that Mawland has never proposed or even suggested that outdoor musical events would be held on site - this is pure local gossip. Our request was only for quiet ambient dining music and even that has been significantly amended</li> <li>• Comparison of the quiet ambient dining / wedding music proposed and music from boats moored elsewhere in the Harbour, over which Mawland has no control, is irrelevant. It is not for the objector to decide that our guests should be limited to hearing “sounds of the waves”.</li> <li>• Mawland stresses it was never intended or suggested that Q Station become a live “music venue” or “pub” - again this is local gossip.</li> <li>• The effect of chanting of “lads on Little Manly Beach” some 2km away, boom boxes on Collins Flat, or “party central at Spring Cove” are not relevant objections to our measured and controlled modification proposal. These are off-site matters which the complainants need to take up with the local police.</li> <li>• Attention is drawn to the email from Nicholas Carlile, Acting Principal scientist, OEH, dated 3 July 2017, confirming that the proposed shade structures will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins and email from Nicholas Carlile dated 26 July 2017, Acting Principal Scientist, OEH confirming that the proposed daylight amplified music/announcements at Open Days will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins (see <b>Appendix E</b>).</li> </ul>
---	-----------------------	---

<p>Anon Manly Resident 1 Douglas Sewell Mary Johnsen</p>	<p>Shade Structure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attention is drawn to email from Nicholas Carlile Acting Principal scientist, OEH, dated 3 July 2017, confirming that the proposed shade structures will not provide an issue for the Little Penguins (see <b>Appendix E</b>).</li> <li>• Attention is also drawn to email from David Pavlich from RMS dated 3 July 2017, noting that it has no concerns with the proposed shade structure/umbrella (see <b>Appendix D</b>).</li> <li>• See Heritage Approvals showing boundary of outside eating area, location of proposed new umbrella and photographs of existing umbrellas (<b>Appendix B</b>). The new umbrella will be of identical design.</li> <li>• Paul Davies (Heritage Architect) has endorsed placement as important for staff and visitor sun protection (see his Report in the original application and p 22 Main Report) and in line with historic use (see <b>Appendix F</b>).</li> <li>• The proposed condition already takes into account the mitigative measures suggested by Mr Davies, NPWS and the original Conditions as to nature, colour, size and approval.</li> <li>• Ms Johnsen's comments that shade structures should be sensitively geared to penguin nesting have been taken into account.</li> </ul>
--	------------------------	--

<p>Anon Manly Resident 1 and 2 Douglas Sewell</p>	<p>Changes to environmental audit cycle timing and site wide plan review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning's attention is directed to Appx 6.3, p 70 Vol 2 of Mawland's Report. The Appendix extracts the Executive Summary of the 2011 Audit Report (which was jointly commissioned by Mawland and NPWS) which suggests a simpler responsive and dynamic approach to site environmental management (see <b>Appendix N</b>).</li> <li>• Attention is also drawn to our comments on p 44ff of the Main Report</li> <li>• Mr Sewell supports the proposed changes to the review cycle.</li> <li>• Planning will recall that our original submission attached a suggested new template for environmental reporting, which was removed from the final documents at Planning's request to simplify the proposal. That template can be made available to Planning again if required. It was prepared by UTS.</li> <li>• It is only sensible to review the Site Wide Plans after each audit cycle, so that the auditor's recommendations and comments can be incorporated (p 46ff Main Report). Mr Sewell agrees with this point.</li> </ul>
---	--	--

<p>Anon Manly Resident 1 Douglas Sewell</p>	<p>Bandicoot responsibility from Stone Arch</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic and Transport Impact Assessments dated 20 June 2017 and 22 August 2017 prepared by GTA Consultants (see <b>Appendix I</b>) addresses the issue of proposed increase in visitor numbers from 450 to 600 for pre-planned events of up to six hours on up to 20 occasions per year in accordance with the application previously provided. We note that Mawland has already agreed to submit procedures for vehicle management to NPWS (p 56 Volume 1 Environmental Assessment Main Report Linchpin)</li> <li>• NPWS has commented that <i>“Bandicoots – due to the increase in activity on the headland, outside of the Mawland lease area and Mawland’s control, it is not appropriate to have triggers for Mawland’s lease not within its control. The area needs to be adjusted and trigger number considered. Regional Operations has addressed this in its response.”</i></li> <li>• Mawland has accepted NPWS Regional C169A proposal and in fact is already in discussions with NPWS about this sign and monitoring. Mawland notes Regional NPWS and Mr Sewell have suggested a revision of mortality numbers for within the site given the reduced length of road (i.e. to only those roads within Mawland’s leased area) and Mawland concurs.</li> <li>• We note The Federation Trust’s comments concerning continued stakeholder cooperation over the whole of North Head and Mawland commits to same.</li> <li>• Mawland’s proposal is that the trigger measures relating to our lease be based on the Q Station internal roads, where monitoring will continue. The mitigative measures Mawland has in place for these roads and indeed for our use of North Head Roads generally are detailed on p 51 of the Main Report.</li> <li>• Mawland notes the list of other users of North Head Roads on p 52 of the Main Report and believes it is not equitable for conditions of Mawland’s lease to be dependent on the behaviour of these groups, which extend beyond our guests, staff and suppliers.</li> </ul>
---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notwithstanding this resident's comments, it is not intended to stop mortality monitoring, only the linkage of full road mortality to Q Station</li> <li>• Mawland remains an active and invested stakeholder in the Bandicoot traffic issue.</li> </ul>
Douglas Sewell Mary Johnsen	Flexibility of Uses	<p>Mr Sewell is a member of the Quarantine Station Community Committee, which endorsed lodgement of the Modification proposal. We thank Mr Sewell for his work with that Group and his measured letter of comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPWS and Mawland confirm that it has always intended to retain the balance of the approved suite of 5 key site activities being accommodation, functions, education, aligned and compatible tourism products and spa activities and that this is adequately safeguarded by proposed Condition 1 (e) p 35 Main Report.</li> <li>• For the reasons specified in pp 32-35 Main Report , and in particular the comments of Paul Davies, on-site flexibility should be permitted provided there is consistency with the intent of the original consent.</li> <li>• Ms Johnsen's statement that educational use of the Asiatic Precinct should be pursued without overnight stays is otiose in that it does not acknowledge the area has been used for such educational purposes for at least 5 years now, forming the "home base" for student tours, educational activities and education products on site.</li> </ul>
Douglas Sewell Mary Johnsen	P1,P2 and P9 Spatial Layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms Johnsen's concerns that there might be division of the "communal rooms" in P1 and P2 are not founded - see Heritage Approvals (<b>Appendix B</b>)</li> <li>• Note that when the requested ensuing is completed there will still be 10% of rooms on site with external bathrooms.</li> </ul>



The following information is included for completeness:

- Letter from National Parks and Wildlife Service dated 25 September 2014 (**Appendix O**)
- Letter from Wilkinson Murray dated 29 October 2015 (**Appendix P**)
- Letter from NSW Planning and Environment dated 28 April 2016 (**Appendix Q**)
- Letter from Mawland to NSW Planning and Environment dated 4 July 2017 (**Appendix R**)

# 7 WORDING OF VARIATIONS TO EXISTING CONDITIONS

The wording of variations to existing conditions have been **marked up to show final Mawland modification requests** taking all above submissions into account.

## 1. CO-PROPONENCY

### Proposed Condition of Planning Approval

*Should the change be accepted, the implications for changes to specific conditions of project approval would be administrative and so are detailed in a table (on the assumption of acceptance) in Volume 3, Section 6.9.3 of the original Environmental Assessment dated August 2015*

## 2. URBAN DESIGN AND VISUAL (SHADE STRUCTURES)

### Proposed Condition of Planning Approval

18) Aspects of the proposal that are approved, subject to modifications or further detailed design, are listed in Schedule 3. The outcomes and objectives to be achieved, and the criteria for assessment of the achievement of the outcome or objective, are also detailed in Schedule 3.

### Schedule 3

#### **~~A6—restaurant and outdoor seating~~ Shade Structures**

- A shade structure/s over the outdoor eating area **beside the Boilerhouse (Building A6)** may be provided, ~~but shall be limited to that part of the outdoor eating area that is obscured by Building A6 when viewed from the head of the wharf. Any such structure/s shall be plain coloured and shall not contain any form of advertising or written/graphic material.~~
- Individual table umbrellas and/or **temporary** shade structures, are permitted in the outdoor eating areas ~~and on~~ including **the wharf area**, where there is no **permanent** shade structure/s ~~subject to the same line of sight conditions referred to above.~~

- *The location, colour and nature of umbrellas or any shade structures must be ~~endorsed 'approved' by the Heritage Advisor~~ reasonably approved by the lessor as to type, location, time limits and frequency of use.*
- *Any umbrella or shade structure must mitigate to the extent possible any adverse visual impact. It shall not contain any third party advertising unrelated to the site and its operation.*
- *The colour and the nature of these temporary shade structures/umbrellas is to be neutral and in keeping with the natural environment.*

### 3. HERITAGE

#### (a) Air Conditioning

##### Proposed Condition of Planning Approval

##### *Schedule 3 Cross-precinct issues*

##### **Approved**

*Various buildings: methods for cooling and heating.*

##### **Specific outcomes/objectives**

- Rooms to be used for ~~accommodation~~, **dining**, kitchens, function and conference related purposes, as well as archival or records storage **and administration**, may include appropriate contemporary technologies for cooling and heating, **which includes installation of room air-conditioning that does not interfere with the fabric of the room and in a way and that is able to be reversed at the conclusion or termination of the Lease.**
- ~~Subject to meeting the specific requirements below, the introduction of ducted mechanical air conditioning shall only be considered for approval in the following areas:~~
  - ~~A2;~~
  - ~~S2; meeting rooms in P10, P11 and P12; and~~
  - ~~in the museum rooms used for archival or records storage.~~
- ~~Subject to meeting the specific requirements below,~~ Ceiling fans may be installed in any building, with preference to fans mounted over the ceiling light to minimise fabric impact.
- Details of any proposed cooling and heating systems shall be included in the construction works application for the particular building. The application must demonstrate that the proposed system:
  - will have as little adverse impact on significant fabric as practicable;
  - will not have significant adverse visual and acoustic impacts; and

*is clearly capable of being removed, and fabric reinstated, at some future point consistent with the principle of reversibility.*

#### (b) Spatial Layout

**Proposed condition of Planning Approval**

20) ~~With the exception of buildings P1 and P2, which are to remain with their current spatial layout and internal configuration,~~ Adaptation of buildings within the First and Second Class Precincts may occur in accordance with the specifications in Table B-2 of the PAS. Adaptation works are to be assessed and approved in accordance with conditions 35)-40), and reflecting the outcomes of the P6 prototype adaptation, and reflecting commitments to 'sampling'.

**Proposed condition of Planning Approval**

21) Buildings P1, P2 and the original rooms that are not adapted are, at the conclusion of the lease, to be returned to their condition and spatial layout/internal configuration as at the commencement date. ~~to remain intact and essentially unaltered, and are to be available for accommodation and/or interpretation purposes for the life of the approval.~~ **Other** permissible alterations include those works that are identified in the staging plan (condition 31) or condition 38). **At all times interpretation of the original spatial layout and internal configuration is to be exhibited prominently near buildings P1 and P2.**

(c) **Flexibility**

**Proposed Condition of Planning Approval**

1) The activity shall be generally carried out in accordance with:

[the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) "Proposal for the Conservation and Adaptive Re-use, North Head Quarantine Station, Sydney Harbour National Park", Volumes 1-5, dated 7 September 2001, except where modified by:

- a) the proposal, including plans, safeguards and mitigation measures, presented in the Preferred Activity Statement (PAS) prepared by the co-proponents dated September 2002;
- b) preliminary details for the proposed adaptation of Building A6 provided by the co-proponents in a facsimile dated 14 October 2002 and in the paper dated 31 October 2002;

- c) the variations proposed to the PAS by the co-proponents in a letter dated 12 November 2002; and
- d) the conditions of this approval (which incorporate the conditions of concurrence and approval granted by the NSW Heritage Council, Minister for Fisheries, Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources).
- e) any future variations to the PAS proposed by Mawland, supported by NSW NPWS, and approved by [OEH Heritage](#) and provided that such variations reflect the [5 key site activities being accommodation, functions, education, aligned and compatible tourism products and spa activities](#) approved for the site in the original conditions of project approval, [for the avoidance of doubt to give flexibility of activity, rooms and space use on site.](#)

#### 4. NOISE

##### (a) Outdoor Music

##### **Proposed Condition of Planning Approval**

201) Amplified music or noise on the site shall be managed on the following basis:

- a) ~~no amplified music shall occur in outdoor areas on the site;~~
- b) ~~other amplified noise in outdoor areas shall be limited to that necessary for essential interpretive purposes, such as guided tours;~~
- ea) amplified indoor music or noise shall not exceed the LAeq noise level of 50 dB(A) as measured at the limits of the Q Station outdoor eating area up to 20 metres away from the edge of the building in which the music or noise is being generated. This level may be amended via the noise management plan, or a variation to that plan, with the approval of the ~~DEC~~NPWS.
- (b) limited ambient dining [or wedding](#) music [\(and announcements\)](#) is permitted in the outdoor eating area adjacent to the Boilerhouse building (Building A6) [during daylight hours](#) provided that it does not exceed the LAeq noise level of 50 dB(A) as measured at the limits of the Q Station outdoor eating area up to 20 metres away from the edge of the Boilerhouse building. The volume and direction of the music/noise should be directed away from the fence adjacent to the cliff. No music equipment shall be placed or operated adjacent to the fence bordering the cliff.

## 5. ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

### (a) Audit Cycle

#### Proposed Condition of Planning Approval

228) Preparation of the first comprehensive audit report shall coincide with the conclusion of stage 2 of the staging plan (condition 31). Subsequent audit reports shall then be undertaken in 2018 (an interim audit referencing the 2012 audit report) and in 2026 (a comprehensive final audit). Subsequent to these reports, audits will be conducted every 8 years thereafter

### (b) Site wide Plan reviews

#### Proposed Conditions of Planning Approval

69) The lessee shall undertake a review of the information management and GIS system from time to time. The review shall focus [through reporting by exception] on the effectiveness of the system for managing data, and currency of information contained within the system, and be submitted to the **OEH**.

72) The **lessor** shall undertake a review of the Aboriginal Heritage Management Plan system within 12 months of the audit dates referred to in Condition 228 (ie within 12 months of audits to be completed in 2018 and 2026). The review shall be undertaken in consultation with the Heritage Council, **OEH** and relevant Aboriginal stakeholders. On the basis of the review the **lessor** shall, as necessary, prepare a revised Aboriginal Heritage Management Plan to be submitted to the Heritage Council and **OEH** for approval. Actions outlined in the plan will be the subject of annual assessment.

89) The **lessor** shall undertake a review of the Moveable Heritage and Resources Plan within 12 months of the audit dates referred to in Condition 228 (ie within 12 months of audits to be completed in 2018 and 2026). On the basis of the review the **lessor** shall, as necessary, prepare a revised Moveable Heritage and Resources Plan to be submitted to the **OEH** and Heritage Council for approval. Actions outlined in the plan will be the subject of annual assessment.

94) The **lessee** shall undertake a review of the Heritage Landscape Master Plan within 12 months of the audit dates referred to in Condition 228 (ie within 12 months of audits to be completed in 2018 and 2026). The review shall be undertaken with advice from a heritage landscape specialist and other

relevant specialists. On the basis of the review the **lessee** shall, as necessary, prepare a revised Heritage Landscape Master Plan to be submitted to the **OEH** and the Heritage Council for approval. Actions outlined in the plan will be the subject of annual assessment.

96) The **lessee** shall undertake a review of the Inscriptions Management Plan within 12 months of the audit dates referred to in Condition 228 (ie within 12 months of audits to be completed in 2018 and 2026). The review shall be undertaken with advice from relevant specialists. On the basis of the review the **lessee** shall, as necessary, prepare a revised Inscriptions Management Plan to be submitted to the **OEH** and the Heritage Council for approval. Actions outlined in the plan will be the subject of annual assessment.

103) The **lessee** shall undertake a review of the Interpretation Plan within 12 months of the audit dates referred to in Condition 228 (ie within 12 months of audits to be completed in 2018 and 2026). The review shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced interpretive planner, in consultation with the Heritage Council. The review shall include, but not be limited to:

- a) the range of interpretive programs being offered at the Quarantine Station. This shall include a review of the content, methods of delivery and consideration of contemporary best practice in interpretation;
- b) consider relevant results of the visitor monitoring program and adaptive management responses;
- c) consider the provisions of any current endorsed conservation management plan for the site; and
- d) provide recommendations for any revisions to the Interpretation Plan.

On the basis of the review the **lessee** shall, as necessary, prepare a revised Interpretation Plan to be submitted to the **OEH** for approval. Actions outlined in the plan will be the subject of annual assessment.

109) The **lessee** shall undertake a review of the Infrastructure Control Plan within 12 months of the audit dates referred to in Condition 228 (ie within 12 months of audits to be completed in 2018 and 2026). The review shall be undertaken in consultation with those agencies listed in condition 105) above, relevant public authorities and infrastructure providers. On the basis of the review the **lessee** shall, as necessary, prepare a revised Infrastructure Control Plan to be submitted to the **OEH** for approval. Actions outlined in the plan will be the subject of annual assessment.

117) The **lessee** shall undertake a review of the Security Plan within 12 months of the audit dates referred to in Condition 228 (ie within 12 months of audits to be completed in 2018 and 2026). The review shall be undertaken in consultation with the NSW Police. On the basis of the review the **lessee** shall, as necessary, prepare a revised Security Plan to be submitted to the **OEH** for approval. Actions outlined in the plan will be the subject of annual assessment.

119) The **lessee** shall undertake a review of the Access Strategy within 12 months of the audit dates referred to in Condition 228 (ie within 12 months of audits to be completed in 2018 and 2026). The review shall be undertaken in consultation with the Heritage Council, Manly Council and the State Transit



Authority. On the basis of the review the **lessee** shall, as necessary, prepare a revised Access Strategy to be submitted to the **OEH** and **DP&I** for approval. Actions outlined in the plan will be the subject of annual assessment.

190) The **lessor** shall undertake a review of the Predator and Pest Control Plan within 12 months of the audit dates referred to in Condition 228 (ie within 12 months of audits to be completed in 2018 and 2026), or earlier if considered necessary by the **OEH**. The review shall be undertaken in consultation with the **OEH** and with advice from relevant specialists. On the basis of the review the co-proponents shall, as necessary, prepare a revised plan to be submitted to the **OEH** for approval. Actions outlined in the plan will be the subject of annual assessment.

208) The **lessee** shall undertake a review of the **Emergency and Evacuation Plan** ~~plan~~ within 12 months of the audit dates referred to in Condition 228 (ie within 12 months of audits to be completed in 2018 and 2026). The review shall be prepared in consultation with the agencies specified in condition 205). On the basis of the review the co-proponents shall, as necessary, prepare a revised Emergency and Evacuation Plan to be submitted to the **OEH** for approval. Actions outlined in the plan will be the subject of annual assessment.

(c) **Bandicoot triggers**

**Proposed Conditions of Planning Approval**

169) The ~~co-proponents~~ lessee shall comply with the adaptive management measures detailed in Schedule 6, and in particular must be an active participant in the mitigation of potential impacts on bandicoot population across North Head. This would include, but not be limited to, participation in the North Head Stakeholder Group, or its successors. The lessee will actively promote awareness of the need for protection of the Q Station bandicoot population.

169A) The ~~co-proponents~~ **lessor** shall provide a sign, at the entrance to Sydney Harbour National Park, just after the Parkhill Archway, to indicate the number of Long-nosed Bandicoot road mortalities within the monitored roads described in Schedule 5. The sign shall include, but not be limited to, a short statement regarding the endangered status of the bandicoot population, its estimated population size (within North Head) and the threat that road deaths pose to its continued survival, the total number of road deaths for the previous year and a running tally of the number of deaths for the current year. The tally shall be updated after each confirmed road death as recorded on the mortality register referred to in Schedule 5. The sign shall also include a 24 hour phone number (see also condition 6) to allow members of the public to inform the co-proponents of any mortalities and what to do if an injured bandicoot is found.[34]

## Schedule 6

- **Boundary of road mortality monitoring**

For the purposes of applying the following trigger mechanisms, Long-nosed Bandicoot road mortalities are those adult mortalities recorded in accordance with the methods specified in Schedule 5 but only for ~~North Head Scenic Drive between the Parkhill Archway to~~ **roads within the Quarantine Station site, commencing at** the Quarantine Station entrance and **including all** the internal roads of the Quarantine Station.

### (d) Site Visitor Capacity

#### Proposed Condition of Planning Approval

120) Visitor management will be focused on the policies of the Visitor Access Strategy and insights from the Integrated Monitoring and Adaptive Management System and responsible management of environmental and cultural impacts. Supporting these:

- a) the optimum visitor capacity shall be up to 315 people (including staff) on site at any one time. The lessee shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that the optimum visitor capacity (or less) is met for a majority of the time during which the site is publicly accessible
- b) the visitor capacity for the site shall be a maximum of 450 people (including staff) on site at any one time, **with the exception of pre-advised dates and periods where events and functions require that it be lifted to 600 people for peak periods of up to six hours on up to 20 occasions per year;**
- c) **the lessee will submit procedures to manage off-site vehicles and visitors to the appropriate authority and minimise impacts for the peak periods that go beyond normal arrangements, including the monitoring of actual visitation, management of traffic, and the management of emergencies (eg fire).**

## 8 CONCLUSION

It is considered that the additional information provided in this Response to Submission together with the information contained in the attachments hereto and the original application adequately addresses the issues raised in submissions.

Having regard to all of the salient information, environmental and economic issues it is considered that the proposed modifications represent reasonable and suitable development, and the Minister is requested to, without further delay, grant approval to this application.