

Appendix 1 Draft Plan of Management for Lot 2 DP 827733, 316 Hudson Parade, Clareville – Community Engagement Report - Verbatim community and stakeholder responses*

This section provides details of community input provided via the online form comments and via email.

*Personal information has been redacted.

Number	Submission
1	The Draft Plan of Management is factually WRONG. Boatshed was small , cute and in keeping with other Pittwater boatsheds. Boatshed was demolished overnight to remove evidence of size. Sea Walls were constructed illegally and have ruined the beach. It's not in keeping at all with every other Pittwater boatshed. Illegal Walls should be removed and the public beach restored . Boatshed is over double size of previous boatshed. I have evidence and am prepared to meet and verbally prove my objection. Sincerely
2	i would like to see more about proposed boat house. what type of structure would it be? also what would be involved in the construction. locally we have just had 2 annoying years of tradies blocking the street with their vehicles on all sides of the street and noise of construction at various residences. not keen for an eye sore on the shoreline.
3	Ensure the prohibited uses documentation is reinforced in any approval. There has been a history of these boatsheds being converted or built to suit domestic and business uses ie power and water with expansive glass viewing areas and entertainment platforms As long as it is purely a shed for boats the use should be approved
4	<i>No comment provided</i>
5	Council land belongs to ratepayers. The current arrangement should now be rescinded and the land returned to full council control and all structures removed. It should be incorporated into the Reserve so that all ratepayers can have access to enjoy what belongs to them.
6	Support this plan, as it continues public right of way. This agreement must be monitored to ensure this occurs.
7	The lease should be granted to owner of the adjoining lot.
8	Absolutely not - why should the owner of the adjoining property have rights over public land, to use as their own. Furthermore, while not contributing any rates to this exclusive use.
9	<i>No comment provided</i>
10	Public reserves should be retained & respected & are there for a reason. They are a precious & vitally important environmental space. Our wildlife desperately needs it to exist. There is already a growing & obvious encroachment 'creep' of non waterfront properties consuming bits of Refuge Cove Reserve into their own 'backyards' Could council please protect what little reserve land we have left & reject applications that benefit only the applicant. Many thanks
11	<i>No comment provided</i>
12	<i>No comment provided</i>
13	How can Council ensure the boat shed is not converted into accommodation as an Airbnb or similar? I think Council should at least charge a fair yearly fee for giving the owners the right to build and possibly make money from this agreement as it adds to the value of the land.
14	<i>No comment provided</i>
15	If this proposal was a replacement of an existing and used boatshed then the proposed new lease and development would be reasonable. However, it is getting on to six years that no boat shed has been there (and stairs?). Hence the proposed development should be considered a

Number	Submission
	new imposition on public land. I don't believe estrangement of such lands by the encroachment of private developments should be permitted.
16	<i>No comment provided</i>
17	<p>The Plan of Management is silent on certain matters which would make the Plan more comprehensible.</p> <p>316 Hudson Pde had a boatshed for some 70 years.</p> <p>Its not totally clear but presumably it became dilapidated. Did it have existing usage rights?</p> <p>A DA was granted for the construction of a new boathouse in April 2022. So that should have allowed for the works to proceed. So why does the owner of 316 now need to get a 20 year licence? This is not clear and seems unreasonable.</p>
18	<i>No comment provided</i>
19	Why lease him the land when they use it anyway is this just a way for council to make money from public land. Leave it as it is
20	It will be great to finally see this boatshed back in its place. It is very pleasing to see Council proactively getting this site back to normal
21	<p>It will be great to finally see this boatshed back in its place as I remember it.</p> <p>Good to see Council proactively getting this site back to normal, I'm sure the boatshed will be well used once back in place.</p>
22	It would be great to see the boat shed back in place.
23	This will bring a great aesthetic to the waterfront.
24	Being a boat owner and a regular user of Pittwater, I feel boat sheds add character to an otherwise bland foreshore. Having looked at the previous boat shed, and the montage of the proposed boat shed, the proposed boat shed is a simple yet elegant design using materials that not only enhance the foreshore, but also the properties behind. It has my full support.
25	It will be great to see the boat shed back in its place. Good work everyone involved.
26	I have lived on the Northern Beaches and have been active on The Pittwater for 47 years. I have always loved the history of the area with boat sheds scattered along the waterfront. With this development I look forward to seeing my memories of these beautiful boathouses restored to the way it should be. These form such a magical history of the area we are so lucky to call home.
27	I support the plan. It will be wonderful to see the boat shed reestablished and the site returned to normal.
28	<p>This will return the waterfront back to the way it should be. Great to see council has got involved to get this done. Don't stand in the way of progress!</p> <p>There are so many beautiful new buildings constructed along Pittwater's waterfront which have materially improved the aesthetics of the area. Looking forward to seeing this site FINALLY evolve into one of those.</p>
29	This is a positive step by Council to return the site back to being a boatshed.
30	<p>Planning looks sensible and it will be good to see a boatshed back there and returning character to the waterfront again.</p> <p>Good to see council supporting the community to keep pittwater traditions and lifestyle.</p>
31	The old shed was an eyesore. Anything the new owner does will be an improvement
32	<i>No comment provided</i>
33	I think it's fantastic to see that the owner is finally getting to put back in place a beautiful boat shed in keeping with the environment.
34	<i>No comment provided</i>
35	<i>No comment provided</i>

Number	Submission
36	<i>No comment provided</i>
37	I'm sure the proposed management plan is the appropriate remedy to this situation. I'd imagine this is only being publicised due to a nasty neighbour. Realistically apart from the existing boatshed being removed, the proposal will be the same as what has existed previously without issue for decades - probably in an even more considerate nature. Let property owners get on with their lives and invest in their property without this excessive bureaucracy. I'm sure there are more pressing items needing attention than trying to stop someone making things right and maintain their existing amenity.
38	Boatsheds are a way of life on Pittwater and will be amazing to see the boatshed back to normal along Pittwater, also good to see the Council being pro-active in getting this back to normal
39	I'm glad/hope this is finally getting resolved. A dilapidated boatshed was knocked down years ago, and should have been replaced with a modern replacement straight away. I'm glad Council is getting involved and I hope it leads to the immediate construction of the new building. Construction should never have stopped in the first place.
40	About time this thing gets built. I hope it's a beautiful building like so many others along the waterfront near by. The owners should be allowed to utilise the waterfront like everyone else.
41	Growing up on Pittwater I had the privilege of having a boatshed that provided access to the beautiful waterway and activities like swimming and sailing with family and friends. When an application is made to reinstate a boatshed that once existed I can't think of any good reason not to approve it. This will also improve amenity and appearance of the foreshore area, and reflect positively on the council. It's a good idea.
42	<p>I believe the area that would be used for private purposes would effectively cut that part of Refuge Cove Reserve into separate ecological (habitat) areas and would impede animals' movement across the Reserve. The Reserve is already sliced into several distinct sections by public access paths and private access paths (some illegal) whereby the integrity of the Reserve has been negatively impacted. Having said that, this new Plan would exacerbate this effect.</p> <p>The Plan should be amended so that no additional access is provided through the Reserve. There are two other public access paths leading to that part of the Cove. The planned building is also out of proportion to the scale of neighbouring shoreline buildings. A better solution could be found for this proposed building as well, although I understand it has been approved.</p>
43	Boat sheds have long been an historical feature of the iconic Pittwater waterfront. On the site in question there was a typical Pittwater boat shed structure for many decades and so it would be fitting to enable its replacement. It must be recognised that the reason for the current Management Plan is the error made by Council in adopting the previous plan which failed to recognise that the boat shed and historical lease existed and so the Plan was flawed. The lease could not technically be renewed because of the flawed plan so the current proposal is to address a past oversight by Council.
44	It will be nice to see the boat shed finally completed after all this time
45	The renewal of this lease was initiated with Council in 2013. The renewal has already previously been approved by both Pittwater Council and Northern Beaches Council since that time. I look forward to concluding these final administrative steps.
46	It will be good to see the boatshed back after 5 years of inactivity
47	<p>To The General Manager</p> <p>Re Lot 2, 316 Hudson Parade Clareville - Plan of Management,</p> <p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I note the deadline for submissions closed yesterday, however I would still like to lodge a comment in support.</p> <p>I have followed the process of [REDACTED] endeavouring to have his boatshed reinstated but having to deal with a sequence of hurdles.</p> <p>I consider the approval of a Plan of Management specifically for this site to be appropriate as it will allow a preexisting boatshed to be rebuilt and still maintain public access along the foreshore. I also note the strip of foreshore land affected was once owned by the previous</p>

Number	Submission
	<p>property owner but was dedicated to council. As such, it would be unreasonable to deny continued access.</p> <p>Regards</p>
48	<p>Dear Northern Beaches Council</p> <p>I recognise that the Plan of Management for 316 Hudson Parade Clareville applies to the approved demolition and improvement works associated with a new Boat Shed, and the requirements for public access on both the front and rear of building.</p> <p>In relation to section 2.4.1 Geology, soils and topography, I note that the plan relies upon the advice of Royal Haskoning DHV, 2019 in which the report concludes that the impacts to the shoreline will be minimised by the "proposed construction".</p> <p>I note that the impacted Sandy Beach south of the boat shed is excluded from the Plan of Management. By inference, no entity is responsible for ensuring the return of the sandy beach which extended 50m to the south of the boat shed between 316 and 320 Hudson Parade. That is, no one is denying that the cause of loss of sand south of the boat shed is a direct result of the dintel wall construction causing the loss of the sand from the previous 50m of length down to 15m (which now remains only opposite 320 Hudson Parade).</p> <p>My query to Council relates to the restoration over time of the sandy beach south of 316 Hudson Parade Boat Shed for the full length (50m, currently 15m) up to the end of 320 Hudson Parade.</p> <p>Can Council please advise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who will have the responsibility to monitor and if needed undertake additional actions to return the sandy shore to the immediate south of the boat shed from its current 15m back to the original 50m, so that the shoreline is no longer a rocky outcrop straight into Pittwater? • How should this obligation be conferred on the responsible party, if not included in the Plan of Management? <p>Kind Regards</p>

Submissions received that are out of scope

Number	Submission
49	<p>Dear Sir Madam,</p> <p>We suspect that Northern Beaches Council is potentially not acting in the best interest of the community or the Natural Environment of Pittwater in regards to the Application No. MOD#2023/0554, the surrounding foreshore and the beach to the south.</p> <p>Our submission/objection to the matter was not published on the Northern Beaches Council website for the community to view online in regards to application #MOD2023/0554.</p> <p>We suspect ours and other objections have been withheld. We suspect council officers/employee's may not be acting in the communities best interests.</p> <p>I shall refer the matter to the ICAC for review.</p>
50	<p>Submission in response to NSW Planning Draft Plan of Management (PoP), Northern Beaches residential development proposal</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is urgent need for clarification around environmental impacts, particularly in Pittwater ward. Ensuring prized and effective environmental controls are maintained.

Number	Submission
	<p>Furthermore, articulation of the risks must be provided. Plus, what is going to be impacted; What is going to be lost; And what will the state government and council retain.</p> <p>2. As the Planning document reads, there is gross overreach with the 'Non-refusal' development standards. Allowing the state government to determine and approve what it deems a complying development.</p> <p>Bypassing council and it's valued public consultation process, is an appalling lack of transparency, bordering on autocratic, that undermines the democratic process.</p> <p>It is also a breach of the residents' and general public's right to know. That cannot be taken away.</p> <p>3. NSW Planning's proposal is grossly incompetent and in-complete. Because it provides fodder for unscrupulous developers. Without the checks and balances of council oversight.</p> <p>I support developments tempered by sensitivities to the location, along with strong design controls (not guidelines which are optional). Incorporating adequate setbacks, highest and best energy and water ratings; landscaping, off street parking, limited site coverage and maximum open space, soft-scape and tree canopy.</p> <p>Design controls which also take into account – and not overload - existing capacities of roads, footpaths, open spaces, power, stormwater and other public utilities. Loss of sunlight and wind tunnels are created by overshadowing of buildings.</p> <p>4. I stress that prior to any increase in residential density, the State Government MUST invest in i) rectifying existing infrastructure and ii) provide greater capacity to fully and properly accommodate new developments.</p> <p>Because current condition of public infrastructure and utilities in the Northern Beaches cannot accommodate the existing capacity. Let alone massive increase in demand that's proposed.</p> <p>5. Traffic roads and parking are all congested. Power and water services fail regularly. Landslides from surface and subterranean flooding occur with heavier rains and climate induced disasters. There is already loss of fauna and flora impacted by urban spread and greater site coverage of buildings.</p> <p>6. NSW Planning must be accountable for development that is apportioned to current capacities, topographies, biodiversity, and climate change risks</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>