

**Committee of the Whole**

**AGENDA NO. 16/09**

**Meeting Date:** Tuesday 3 November 2009  
**Location:** Committee Room 2, Level 5, Civic Centre, 1 Devlin Street, Ryde  
**Time:** 7.30pm

**Note:** *This meeting will be recorded on audio tape for minute-taking purposes as authorised by the Local Government Act 1993.*

**NOTICE OF BUSINESS**

<b>Item</b>		<b>Page</b>
1	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES .....	1
2	COMPANION ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE- Minutes of Meeting held on 7 September 2009.....	2
3	EASTWOOD PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND MOBILITY PLAN .....	11
4	EASTWOOD & TERRY'S CREEK FLOODPLAIN RISK MANAGEMENT STUDY & PLAN - Adoption of Final Study Documents .....	16
5	GRAFFITI MANAGEMENT CONTRACT 2009-2010 - COR-RFT-No. 09/09 .....	22
6	HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE - Minutes 04 / 09 .....	26

**1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

**File Number:** GRP/09/5/3 - BP09/849

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Minutes of the Committee of the Whole No. 15/09 held on 06 October 2009, be confirmed.

---

**2 COMPANION ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE- Minutes of Meeting held on 7 September 2009**

---

**Report prepared by:** Ranger Technical Support

**Report dated:** 8/10/2009

**File No.:** GRP/09/6/3 - BP09/798

---

**Report Summary**

This report presents the minutes of the meeting of the Companion Animal Advisory Committee (Attached) held on 7 September 2009 and recommends the attached minutes be received and noted.

**Background**

The Committee is chaired by Councillor O'Donnell.

**Report**

The minutes from the meeting held 7 September 2009 are attached to this report. The next meeting is proposed for 1 March 2010.

**Consultation**

Internal Council business units consulted included:-

- Not Applicable

Internal Workshops held:-

- Not Applicable

City of Ryde Advisory Committees consulted included:-

- Companion Animal Advisory Committee

External public consultation included:-

- Not Applicable

**Critical Dates**

There are no critical dates or deadlines to be met.

**Management Plan Budget / Linkages**

This project is from the Management Plan Key Outcome (G3) listed on page No. 76 of the Management Plan 2009-2013.

**ITEM 2 (continued)****Relationship to Key Outcome Areas**People

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for People (set out on page 50 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- P2 A city that plans for people by involving them in decision making to improve their quality of life.

Community members on the Advisory Committee provide valuable input on Companion Animal management issues.

Assets

This matter has no direct relationship to this key outcome area.

Environment

This matter has no direct relationship to this key outcome area.

Governance

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Governance (set out on page 79 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- G1 Improved awareness and understanding of Council's decisions by the community.
- G2 Members of the community are engaged in democratic decision making.
- G3 Review of best practice approaches on Governance to enhance the delivery of services to the community.
- G5 Compliance with all legislative requirements and statutory obligations.
- G6 An efficient and effective regulatory environment.

Companion Animal Advisory Committee members represent the community, business and animal welfare organisations of the City of Ryde in the promotion of responsible pet ownership and provide input into the development of future Companion Animal Programmes. CAAC members will assist the community and Council's engagement responsibilities to the public and will have an affirmative effect on the community through consultation and feedback between the CAAC and Council on Companion Animal ownership along with access to Companion Animal information.

**Financial Impact**

Adoption of the option(s) outlined in this report will have no financial impact.

**Policy Implications**

There are no policy implications through adoption of the recommendation.

**Other Options**

Not Applicable

**ITEM 2 (continued)**

**Conclusion**

The primary role of the Companion Animals Advisory Committee for Ryde is to consider key Companion Animal issues and make recommendations to Council.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the report of the Ranger Technical Support, dated 8/10/2009 on COMPANION ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE- Minutes of Meeting held on 7 September 2009, be received and noted.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- 1 Companion Animal Advisory Committee, Minutes of meeting 7 September 2009

Report Prepared By:

**Cassandra Martin**  
**Ranger Technical Support**

Report Approved By:

**Leon Marskell**  
**Manager - Regulatory Services**

**Dominic Johnson**  
**Group Manager Environment & Planning**

ITEM 2 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

## **MINUTES OF MEETING**

### **COMPANION ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Monday, 7<sup>th</sup> September 2009  
Level 5, Committee Room  
Civic Centre, Top Ryde**

**PRESENT:** Councillor G O'Donnell (GO) – Chairman (The Chair)

Mr. L Marskell (LM) Manager – Regulatory Services

Mrs. J Willis (JW)

Mrs. H Johnstone (HJ)

Mrs. J Aiello (JA)

Mrs. N Alexanian (NA)

Mr. D Ngeru (DN) Senior Ranger

**APOLOGIES:** Ms. N Thompson (NT) Compliance Ranger

**ITEM 2 (continued)****ATTACHMENT 1****1. PRESENT**

As above

**2. APOLOGIES**

As above

**3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING MATTERS ARISING**

Meeting opened by GO at 5.05pm. Minutes of last meeting moved by GO and approved by all present. JA and NA were late arrivals during item 3.1 of the agenda.

**3.1 Request for leash free area in Darvall Park- Update**

LM advised he had discussions with the Manager of Parks Department who confirmed there is no intention to move Darvall Park as an off leash park in the current 2009/2012 Management Plan, however did state it may be something that can be re-investigated in the future.

GO suggested the City of Ryde should go the way of City of Sydney and declare all Parks off leash and work backwards.

LM informed the Committee not all Parks in either CoS or Nth Sydney were off leash and Council should be mindful of recent incidents resulting in Public Liability claims against incidents like the dog attack at Meadowbank Park after the fence came down. LM informed the committee that any recommendation for any off leash area should include that it be fully fenced to keep the dogs inside, rather than fencing the children in.

NA spoke at length on being a local who uses Darvall Park with other locals as an unofficial off leash area. She thinks there has been an influx of younger families with more animals and the decision should be changed. She advised there is great community involvement and communication between park users brought about by their dogs being allowed to be off leash in Darvall Park.

**3.2 Meadowbank Park Operating Hours- Update**

LM advised a report has been prepared by the Manager of Parks to go before Council in the coming weeks and although the content of this report can not be discussed at this meeting, LM advised there had been considerable feedback in relation to the survey conducted, both positive and negative.

**ITEM 2 (continued)****ATTACHMENT 1**

Considerable discussion was had in relation to who was making presentations to the Council meeting.

JW advised she would be speaking at Council and a number of other leash free area users have also applied to speak at council.

**ACTION:**

**LM to provide feedback on Council resolution at next meeting 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010.**

4. **PROPOSED CHANGE FROM COMPANION ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO COMPANION ANIMALS WORKING GROUP**

LM informed the committee of the proposed changes to the Companion Animal Advisory Committee, following the review of how many Committees Councillors were attending and the need to consolidate these into a more manageable number. In effect, this would involve little change, other than the name change and the fact that LM would act as the chairperson. Councillors would still be able to sit in on meetings if they wished. The membership would remain the same. Minutes would be sent through to Councillors in the CIB, and not formally adopted through Council.

Discussion was had as to whether this was the best way forward for the Committee. It was agreed this proposal would not be supported when it was raised at council.

5. **GENERAL BUSINESS**

**5.1 Registration Fees**

JA inquired how the \$40 registration fee paid by dog owners was utilised by Council. JA suggested that perhaps dog owners did not pay the fee as they were unable to see any benefit from paying the fee. Perhaps more awareness of how paying the fee would benefit them would increase payment of the fee.

LM advised the identification and registration rate within the City of Ryde is very poor. With only approx 5,000 ID dogs and approx. 6,500 registered dogs. It is estimated through the bureau of statistics at least 50 % of dwelling have at least 1 – 2 Companion Animals.

**ITEM 2 (continued)****ATTACHMENT 1**

This result in a very small return of registration dollars to Council after the DLG has taken their percentage. These fees are used to pay for staff, equipment, pound facilities, upgrade of Website information, education programs etc. The City of Ryde's expenditure managing the program exceeds the registration fees received each year.

**5.2 Wildlife Protection Area report to Council request feedback**

LM advised the Parks Department are seeking to have Wildlife Protection Area (WPA) introduced in Field of Mars and Brush Farm. LM requested committee members to look at this information and provide feedback if they feel it necessary.

**5.3 CAWG Membership**

HJ asked if the membership would remain the same if Council decides to change the Committee to a Working Group.

LM advised it would.

**5.4 Council Email Group**

JA asked if it was possible for the Advisory Group to have an email address for interested members in the community to contact the group for information about Companion Animals and for suggestions.

**ACTION:**

**LM to investigate this issue with Corporate Services and provide feedback at next meeting 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010.**

**5.5 Information Pack to Residents**

NA raised the issue of registration and whether new animal owners get a welcome pack like new residents that move into the area. GO suggest that a brochure similar to the new "Good Neighbour" be considered. LM advised considerable information is now available on the web after the development of a specific Animal link. LM to investigate what options are open to Council under the current budget. Information to possibly include more local content i.e. leash free areas, vets and the proposed CAAC member email address (as requested in 5.4)

**ACTION:**

**LM to provide feedback at next meeting 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010.**

**ITEM 2 (continued)****ATTACHMENT 1****5.6 Change of starting time to 5.30pm**

NA requested consideration of change to starting time of CAAC to 5.30pm. Request to be forwarded onto Group Manager – Corporate Services to report back.

**ACTION:**

**LM to provide feedback via email before next meeting.**

**5.7 Poo Bags and Bins – Shrimptons Creek submission**

JA is unaware of any bins along the walkway between Macquarie Centre and Flinders Park. JA requested an update regarding installation of bins between Macquarie Centre and Quarry Road that could be used for dog faeces bags

LM advised Parks have been requested to install Bins at major cross over points with major roads, however there is limited funding available.

GO asked how the bins were going at Meadowbank Park and HJ and JW advised the Red Bins are working well.

**ACTION:**

**LM to provide feedback at next meeting 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010.**

**5.8 Vandalism of Noticeboard – Blenheim Park**

JA advises the notice board at Blenheim Park has been removed.

**ACTION:**

**LM to notify Parks and provide feedback at next meeting 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010.**

**5.9 Blenheim Park – State of ground**

NA advises the grass is dead at Blenheim Park and is there anything that can be done about it. LM advises it maybe due to the high use of the park. Meadowbank Park does not suffer as much as there is a lower volume of users.

**ACTION:**

**LM to notify Parks and provide feedback at next meeting 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010.**

**ITEM 2 (continued)**

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**5.10 Companion Animals Management plan to be reviewed and updated by April 2010.**

**ACTION:**

**LM to provide review policy draft by next meeting.**

**No further general business. Meeting declared closed approx 6.50pm**

**NEXT MEETING:**

**The next meeting of the Companion Animal Advisory Committee will be held on 1 March 2010**

### 3 EASTWOOD PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND MOBILITY PLAN

---

**Report prepared by:** Sustainability Engineer

**Report dated:** 8/10/2009

**File No.:** ENV/08/3/9/2 - BP09/800

---

#### **Report Summary**

City of Ryde has developed a Draft Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan (PAMP) for the Eastwood town centre (**CIRCULATED SEPARATELY**).

This PAMP provides Council with the tools to deliver long term planning goals for pedestrian access and mobility in Eastwood.

The PAMP also complements and expands on recommendations from the Eastwood Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (Eastwood TMAP) developed in 2007.

#### **Background**

The development of PAMP's was identified as a key action in the Ryde Integrated Transport and Land Use Strategy (RITLUS) and the Eastwood PAMP is the first of a series to be completed for six key centres in Ryde. The preparation of the Eastwood PAMP commenced during 2008-2009 under the 2008-2012 Management Plan.

A PAMP is a comprehensive strategic action plan to develop pedestrian policies and improve pedestrian facilities for a locality. PAMPs aim to co-ordinate investment in safe, convenient and connected pedestrian routes and provide a framework for developing or improving pedestrian routes.

#### **Report**

Together with the Roads and Traffic Authority of New South Wales (RTA), all local councils in NSW have a responsibility to provide safe, convenient and connected pedestrian routes which will encourage people to walk rather than use their cars.

The PAMP has been designed as per RTA guidelines and clearly identifies actions to improve a continuous and comprehensive integrated pedestrian network within Eastwood. Factors such as pedestrian concentration, access to public transport and other community facilities have been used in the ranking of priority routes. The PAMP study also incorporates linkages between major attractors both within the town centres and in their immediate surrounds.

The development of the PAMP followed the process of setting a target study area as per RTA Guidelines (800m radius from town centre) and priority pedestrian routes. These routes were identified via site visits and pedestrian counts which observed and established user behaviour. The priority routes were also audited via on-foot Route Field Audits to determine the type and scale of work required along designated pedestrian routes. This included assessing for path of travel including gradient and width of paths and obstructions to paths as well as pedestrian crossing locations, lighting and pedestrian safety. From site visits, audits and stakeholder consultation a Draft Work Plan was developed to match priority routes. The Work Plan actions are classified as high (1), medium (2) and low (3) priority.

**ITEM 3 (continued)**

The PAMP is consistent with the key outcome areas within the 2009-2013 Management Plan, is identified as a high priority action within the RITLUS and is supported by the Eastwood TMAP.

**Consultation**

Internal Council business units consulted included:-

- Urban Planning
- Access

Internal Workshops held:-

- None

City of Ryde Advisory Committees consulted included:-

- None

External public consultation included:-

- General media promotion for community consultation opportunity through survey and general comments
- 100 stakeholder surveys distributed throughout the study area and to the wider Eastwood.
- Focus Group workshop held with 12 attendees from key stakeholder groups

**Comments**

- Results from the survey are available within the Draft PAMP.
- A sample of the questionnaire is included in Appendix B of the Draft PAMP.
- Attendance list and summary notes are provided in Appendix C of the Draft PAMP.

**Critical Dates**

There are no critical dates or deadlines to be met.

**Management Plan Budget / Linkages**

This project is from the Management Plan (Eg. Key Action Plan/Capital Works Etc) listed on page No. 68 of the Management Plan 2009-2013.

**Relationship to Key Outcome Areas****People**

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for People (set out on page 50 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- P1 A vibrant city that is economically strong and engages its community through cultural and social activities.
- P2 A city that plans for people by involving them in decision making to improve their quality of life.

**ITEM 3 (continued)**

Vulnerable groups such as children, older people, those with disabilities and the disadvantaged are more likely to depend on a combination of walking and public transport. Provision that favours the creation of walkable communities will not only benefit these groups but also the community at large. The PAMP provides for more appropriate pedestrian facilities, especially in busy areas, improved access for mobility-impaired groups in the community, including older persons and safe and convenient crossing opportunities on major roads all resulting in increased health benefits for the community. The development of Eastwood PAMP involved consultation and engagement with the Eastwood community in several different ways. These included communication via media with multilingual translations, stakeholder surveying and a focus group meeting.

**Assets**

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Assets (set out on page 60 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- A1 Well designed streets and paths where motorists, cyclists and pedestrians feel safe.
- A2 Well designed places and spaces that minimise personal harm and where people interact with each other.
- A3 A high standard of visual appearance for our infrastructure, built environment and public areas.

The PAMP provides links with existing user plans such as bike plans, maintenance programs and accessible public transport and works towards providing improved pedestrian facilities which are consistent and appropriate throughout NSW with RTA standards. The PAMP aims to increase the accessibility and safety of urban areas for users particularly relating to spaces, streets and paths.

**Environment**

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Environment (set out on page 69 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- E1 Clean air through better integrated transport systems.
- E6 Sustainable practices in buildings, waste management, transport, energy systems and water use.

The PAMP demonstrates methods of improving links with other transport systems and services to achieve an integrated land use and transport facilities network. The PAMP encourages active transport through increasing the accessibility of pedestrian facilities. Active transport results in cleaner air and more sustainable practices in urban environments.

**ITEM 3 (continued)****Governance**

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Governance (set out on page 79 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- G1 Improved awareness and understanding of Council's decisions by the community.
- G2 Members of the community are engaged in democratic decision making.
- G3 Review of best practice approaches on Governance to enhance the delivery of services to the community.
- G5 Compliance with all legislative requirements and statutory obligations.

The development of the PAMP involved community consultation with various members of the community, community organisations, Chamber of Commerce and government agencies such as the State Transit Authority. The PAMP engaged members of the community through a focus group which encouraged open communication and discussion regarding pedestrian facilities and safety in Eastwood. The Eastwood PAMP has been developed according to RTA guidelines, consistent with state wide planning.

**Financial Impact**

It is estimated that the total cost of the works identified in the PAMP for Eastwood is \$259,000. This total cost may be broken up into high priority actions being \$106,000 and medium or low priority actions being \$153,000.

- Repairs to small sections of footpath, trimming of trees, notifications to utilities can be completed this financial year where there are available operational funds.
- Installation of kerb ramps and provision of paving to bus stops can be listed for consideration in the capital works programs for Kerb Ramps and Implement Integrated Strategy either in 2010/11 or subsequent years.
- Other unfunded items can be considered for maintenance of capital works programs for subsequent years.

**Policy Implications**

There is no policy implications associated with adopting this report.

**Other Options**

Nil

**Conclusion**

This PAMP identifies actions to improve a continuous and comprehensive integrated pedestrian network within Eastwood and is an integral part of the improvement in enhancing pedestrian accessibility in the area. The implementation of the PAMP will be particularly advantageous in areas of pedestrian concentration and will result in a reduction in pedestrian access severance, enhancing safe and convenient crossing opportunities on major roads.

**ITEM 3 (continued)**

The PAMP will also foster improvements in the level of personal mobility and safety for pedestrians with disabilities and older persons as well as provide links with other transport services to achieve an integrated land use and transport network.

The Eastwood PAMP is consistent with the key outcome areas within the Management Plan, is identified as a high priority action within the RITLUS and is supported by the Eastwood TMAP.

Implementation will be coordinated through existing programs, where funding permits. The priorities provided in the PAMP report will assist in identifying areas where the maximum benefit to pedestrians will be realised. Unfunded works will be listed for consideration of funding in future works programs.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- (a) That the report of the Sustainability Engineer, dated 8/10/2009 on Draft Eastwood Town Centre Pedestrian Access Mobility Plan be received and noted.
- (b) That the Draft Eastwood Pedestrian and Mobility Plan be endorsed and appropriate funding allocations for staged implementation of the Plan be considered in the preparation of future asset and traffic management plans.

**ATTACHMENTS**

No attachments

Report Prepared By:

**Sarah Kinsela**  
**Sustainability Engineer**

Report Approved By:

**Sam Cappelli**  
**Manager - The Environment**

**Dominic Johnson**  
**Group Manager Environment & Planning**

#### 4 EASTWOOD & TERRY'S CREEK FLOODPLAIN RISK MANAGEMENT STUDY & PLAN - Adoption of Final Study Documents

---

**Report prepared by:** Manager Catchments & Assets

**Report dated:** 20/10/2009

**File No.:** GRP/09/3/3 - BP09/840

---

##### **Report Summary**

To recommend Council adoption of the Eastwood & Terry's Creek Flood Study and Floodplain Management Study & Plan, including the new planning approach to managing floodplain development.

##### **Background**

The floodplain risk management program is being undertaken by the City of Ryde in accordance with process outlined in the NSW Government's *Floodplain Development Manual*, gazetted in April 2005. The program is part funded by the Commonwealth and NSW Governments.

The *Floodplain Development Manual* assists councils in developing and implementing floodplain management plans, and is the practical expression of the NSW Governments *Flood Prone Land Policy*.

The Eastwood & Terry's Creek Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan focuses on the Eastwood and Terry's Creek stormwater catchments. These have a combined area of approximately 495 hectares (4.95 square kilometres). The project includes: -

- Flood Study Report (defines the flood problem)
- Floodplain Risk Management Study (looks at what can be done)
- Floodplain Risk Management Plan (recommended plan of action)

The project has been overseen by Council's Floodplain Management Committee which is comprised of community representatives, Councillors and staff from the City of Ryde, Parramatta City and Hornsby Shire councils', and representatives from various NSW Government agencies including Railcorp, the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW) and Sydney Water.

##### **Report**

Community consultation on the draft Flood Study and draft Floodplain Risk Management Study & Plan for Eastwood & Terry's Creek has now been completed. Copies of the final Flood Study and Floodplain Management Study and Plan are **CIRCULATED UNDER SEPARATE COVER**.

Community consultation has been an important component of this project. Key elements of this consultation process have been as follows:

- regular meetings of the Eastwood & Terry's Creek Floodplain Management Committee (FMC).
- public review of the flood study results, including a public display during July and August 2007, and information day and feedback process.
- extensive workshops with local residents over November 2008

**ITEM 4 (continued)**

- public exhibition of the floodplain management study & plan during February and March 2009, including public displays and community workshops, prior to formal consideration by Council

At its meeting of 24 September 2009, Council's FMC resolved to recommend to Council adoption of the Eastwood & Terry's Creek Flood Study and Floodplain Management Study & Plan. The minutes of the FMC meeting of 24 September 2009 are **CIRCULATED UNDER SEPARATE COVER**.

Adoption of the recommended Plan has the following key benefits for the City of Ryde:

- Council will be eligible to seek grant funding from the NSW Government and its agencies such as Sydney Water for costs associated with the implementation of flood mitigation works.
- Council will be taken to have acted in good faith by substantially complying with the *Floodplain Development Manual*, and so afforded immunity from liability under Section 733 of the Local Government Act;
- The Plan includes strategies to implement flood risk management in partnership with the private sector through the development process. The proposed Development Control Plan (DCP) provide detailed guidance to new development within flood affected areas.
- the more detailed flood mapping and DCP controls will contribute to development certainty within the Eastwood & Terry's Creek floodplain, and in the Eastwood Town Centre in particular.

The recommended Plan includes a new planning approach to managing floodplain development. The approach provides for more detailed flood planning controls and recommends inclusion of a new clause – Development on Flood Liable Land – in the city wide LEP, as well as new flood risk and overland flow precinct maps.

It is proposed that the Urban Planning Unit review the recommended clause with the aim of incorporating it into the comprehensive LEP and amending specific provisions relating to development outcomes in Eastwood Town Centre. The final form of LEP provisions will be reported to Council in 2010 together with information regarding the comprehensive city wide LEP and Local Strategy.

The recommended Plan proposes that draft development controls entitled *Floodplain Management* be included in the City of Ryde Development Control Plan 2008. It is proposed that the DCP provisions are exhibited in accordance with the EP&A Act and the outcomes of the exhibition reported to Council.

**Consultation**

Internal Council business units consulted included:-

- Urban Planning

Internal Workshops held:-

- Not Applicable

**ITEM 4 (continued)**

City of Ryde Advisory Committees consulted included:-

- Eastwood & Terry's Creek Floodplain Management Committee

External public consultation included:-

- Local residents

**Comments**

A detailed community consultation report has previously been provided to Council and to members of the local community. The minutes of the most recent FMC contain details of the most recent issues raised by local residents, and the response provided by Council's consultants.

**Critical Dates**

The following deadlines are required to be met:

- This project is a key component in finalising the Draft Masterplan for the Eastwood Town Centre. Note: The Eastwood Town Centre Transport Management and Access Plan was recently completed and adopted by Council.

**Management Plan Budget / Linkages**

This project forms part of the 2009/2010 Operational Budget for the Public Works Group.

**Relationship to Key Outcome Areas****People**

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for People (set out on page 50 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- P2 A city that plans for people by involving them in decision making to improve their quality of life.

Members of the local community are actively involved in determining the outcomes of the project through representation on the floodplain management committee, and through public exhibition of the flood study and floodplain risk management study and plan.

**Assets**

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Assets (set out on page 60 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- A2 Well designed places and spaces that minimise personal harm and where people interact with each other.

This report outlines a best practice approach to floodplain management that seeks to reduce the risk to the community from floods through an integrated set of works and policy initiatives, developed in accordance with NSW Government policy.

**ITEM 4 (continued)**Environment

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Environment (set out on page 69 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- E6 Sustainable practices in buildings, waste management, transport, energy systems and water use.

This project seeks to achieve a sustainable balance between flood risk and land development.

Governance

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Governance (set out on page 79 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- G1 Improved awareness and understanding of Council's decisions by the community.  
G2 Members of the community are engaged in democratic decision making.  
G3 Review of best practice approaches on Governance to enhance the delivery of services to the community.  
G5 Compliance with all legislative requirements and statutory obligations.

This project represents a best practice approach to floodplain management by ensuring community participation and compliance with the NSW *Government's Flood Prone Land Policy* and supporting legislation.

**Financial Impact**

The additional expenditure required by the ongoing community consultation will be funded from the 2009/10 Operating Budget of the Public Works Group.

**Policy Implications**

This report recommends Council adopt the draft flood planning controls and precinct maps as formal Council policy to guide development, and also seeks Council endorsement to proceed with the formal preparation of the floodplain management related components of the LEP and DCP in accordance with the EP&A Act.

**Other Options**

The Council may:

- Endorse the recommendations of this report without change;
- Endorse the recommendations of this report with amendments; or
- Reject the recommendations of this report.

It is considered, however, that the core recommendations of this report seeking the adoption of the final study documents and the endorsement of the new planning approach to managing floodplain development are the appropriate course of action for the City of Ryde.

**ITEM 4 (continued)****Conclusion**

Following extensive community consultation and oversight by Council's Floodplain Management Committee, this report now seeks Council adoption of the Flood Study and Floodplain Management Study & Plan for Eastwood & Terry's Creek.

These documents have been developed in accordance with the NSW Government's *Flood Prone Land Policy* and represent a best practice approach to managing floodplain development.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- (a) That the report of the Manager Catchments & Assets, dated 20/10/2009 on EASTWOOD & TERRY'S CREEK FLOODPLAIN RISK MANAGEMENT STUDY & PLAN - Adoption of Final Study Documents, be received and noted.
- (b) That Council adopts the Eastwood & Terry's Creek Flood Study and Floodplain Management Study and Plan and supporting model files as the basis for managing development and guiding flood mitigation works in the Eastwood and Terry's Creek stormwater catchments.
- (c) That Council endorses the planning approach outlined in the Floodplain Management Study, and the use of this approach in the interim as formal Council policy to guide development within the City of Ryde.
- (d) That flood management clauses be prepared and included in the city wide comprehensive LEP 2011 and existing flood management clauses within Ryde DLEP 2008 relating to Eastwood Town Centre be also reviewed in the preparation of the comprehensive plan.
- (e) That Council resolves to prepare and exhibit the Floodplain Management Development Control Plan for inclusion in Ryde Development Control 2006 in accordance with the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.
- (f) That Council refer a copy of the adopted Floodplain Management Study and Plan to the Department of Planning and Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water to seek their endorsement to the recommendations for the preparation of LEP and DCP controls, and to vary the provisions of the new flood planning guidelines on the basis of 'exceptional circumstances'.

**ATTACHMENTS**

There are no attachments for this report.

Report Prepared By:

**Matthew Lewis**  
**Manager Catchments & Assets**

Report Approved By:

**Kim Woodbury**  
**Group Manager - Public Works**

---

**5 GRAFFITI MANAGEMENT CONTRACT 2009-2010 - COR-RFT-No. 09/09**

---

**Report prepared by:** Manager - Operations**Report dated:** 22/10/2009**File No.:** GRP/09/3/3 - BP09/843

---

**Report Summary**

This report is to advise Council of the outcomes of the Request for Tender COR RFT No.09/09 relating to Graffiti Management Services. It recommends the acceptance of the tender received from Graffiti Clean Pty Ltd.

**Background**

Over recent years, Council has managed graffiti removal using a mixture of both in-house resources and a number of contractors. The graffiti response and record keeping is managed by council's registration with the Australian Graffiti Register. The register has been well subscribed to by many councils, government agencies and graffiti contractors and is being used by the NSW Police to track offenders.

It is proposed to engage one contractor by public tender to provide all graffiti removal services for the entire city. It is anticipated that there will be significant cost savings and efficiencies in dealing with the one contractor.

The tender is for service delivery for one year with a second year option. Tender submission are to provide prices for the following:-

- Initial audit and removal
- All inclusive, monthly lump sum price for removal of graffiti from Council property within three days.
- All inclusive, monthly lump sum price for removal of graffiti from Council property and up to 50 private properties within three days.
- Emergency removal within six hours
- Rate for removal per square metre (only to be used for works additional to contract)

**Report**

The Request for Tender was publicly advertised on 7<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> July 2009. Tender submissions were received from the following respondents (alphabetical order):

1. Bay Maintenance
2. Challenger Cleaning
3. Complete Infrastructure
4. Graffiti Clean
5. Graffiti Gone
6. Graffiti Specialist
7. Prime Facility
8. Techni Clean
9. Urban Maintenance Services (UMS)
10. Work Zone
11. Wunderguard

**ITEM 5 (continued)**

A tender evaluation panel consisting of three (3) Council Officers was established to assess the responses:

The assessment was based on the following criteria as outlined in the Request for Tender document.

- Price/Overall submission
- Experience /Referees
- Organizational capacity
- Staff/methodology

A **CONFIDENTIAL** Tender Evaluation Report including an Assessment matrix are **ON FILE and CIRCULATED UNDER SEPARATE COVER**. Pursuant to Section 10A (2)(d) of the Local Government Act 1993, this document is listed as confidential as it contains commercial information of a confidential nature that would, if disclosed, prejudice the commercial position of the persons who supplied it. Furthermore, it is considered that discussion in open meeting would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest as it could affect Councils ability to secure the preferred tenderers.

Following the above evaluation process, the preferred tenderer is Graffiti Clean Pty Ltd who offered very competitive rates and also provides the following advantages:-

- Dedicated vehicle and technician 5 days per week and after hours response at no additional cost.
- Vehicle purposely built for the graffiti removal work with built in colour matching unit, spill containment and water recycling.
- Additional fleet vehicles available for backup
- Initial audit and removal at no additional cost
- Emergency removal at no additional cost.
- Vehicle can display RCC Logo.
- Registered with the Australian Graffiti Register

**Consultation**

Internal Council business units consulted included:-

- Access Unit
- Parks Unit

Internal Workshops held:-

- Not Applicable

City of Ryde Advisory Committees consulted included:-

- Not Applicable

External public consultation included:-

- Not Applicable

**ITEM 5 (continued)****Critical Dates**

There are no critical dates or deadlines to be met.

**Management Plan Budget / Linkages**

Relationship to Key Outcome Areas

**People**

This matter has no direct relationship to this key outcome area

**Assets**

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Assets (set out on page 60 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- A1 Well designed streets and paths where motorists, cyclists and pedestrians feel safe.

**Environment**

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Environment (set out on page 71 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

Contractors are required to abide by Council's environmental policies and procedures

**Governance**

This matter has no direct relationship to this key outcome area.

**Financial Impact**

This program forms part of the 2009/2010 Operational Budget. Based on past levels of graffiti within the City of Ryde the cost incurred under this contract would be around \$100,000 per year.

**Policy Implications**

There are no policy implications through adoption of the recommendation.

**Other Options**

Consideration of multiple contractors or increasing in house capability has been considered, however these options are not considered to be cost effective.

**Conclusion**

The preferred contractor, Graffiti Clean Pty Ltd is considered the most suited tenderer to supply economic and quality graffiti removal.

**ITEM 5 (continued)****RECOMMENDATION:**

- (a) That the report of the Manager - Operations, dated 22/10/2009 on GRAFFITI MANAGEMENT CONTRACT 2009-2010 - COR-RFT-No. 09/09, be received and noted.
- (b) That the Graffiti Management Tender (COR-RFT No-09/09) be awarded Graffiti Clean Pty Ltd for a term of 12 months with an option to extend the contract for a further 12 months. The contract to be awarded for the all inclusive Graffiti Removal from Council property and up to 50 private properties for the monthly lump sum price of \$ 6,800.00.
- (c) That the unsuccessful tenderers be advised accordingly.

**ATTACHMENTS**

There are no attachments to this report.

Report Prepared By:

**Barry Hodge**  
**Manager - Operations**

Report Approved By:

**Kim Woodbury**  
**Group Manager - Public Works**

---

**6 HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE - Minutes 04 / 09**

---

**Report prepared by:** Heritage Officer**Report dated:** 26/10/2009**File No.:** GRP/09/6/3 - BP09/853

---

**Report Summary**

This report advises Council of the outcomes of the Heritage Advisory Committee meeting no. 04/09 held on 26/08/09

The report recommends that minute nos. 01-11 of the Heritage Advisory Committee meeting no. 04/09 held on 26 August 2009 be received and noted.

**Background**

The heritage Advisory Committee meets bimonthly to discuss issues relating to the conservation and enhancement of items and places within the City of Ryde that are of natural, indigenous, cultural, social, aesthetic and historic significance.

**Report**

The minutes of the Heritage Advisory Committee meeting 04/09 are **ATTACHED (Attachment A)**

**Consultation**

Internal Council business units consulted included:-

- Community Services
- Property Services
- Parks

Internal Workshops held:-

- Not applicable

City of Ryde Advisory Committees consulted included

- Not Applicable

External public consultation included:-

- Brush Farm Historical Society
- Ryde District Historical Society

**Comments**

The Committee draws representation from a range of organisations – including historical societies, progress and community associations and specific interest groups. The issues addressed by the committee relate to a number of units of Council – in particular Community Services, Property Services and Parks.

**Critical Dates**

There are no critical dates or deadlines to be met.

**ITEM 6 (continued)****Management Plan Budget / Linkages**

Many of the issues addressed by the Committee are identified in the Management Plan. The functions and role of the Committee also address a number of key outcomes listed in the Plan.

This project forms part of the 2009/2010 Operational Budget for (Action Plan Group).

**Relationship to Key Outcome Areas**People

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for People (set out on page 50 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- P1 A vibrant city that is economically strong and engages its community through cultural and social activities.
- P2 A city that plans for people by involving them in decision making to improve their quality of life.
- P3 A harmonious community through a culturally enriched and respectful society.

The Committee provides input on projects and tasks that are being developed and are kept updated on projects and works being undertaken by Council.

Assets

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Assets (set out on page 60 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- A1 Well designed streets and paths where motorists, cyclists and pedestrians feel safe.
- A2 Well designed places and spaces that minimise personal harm and where people interact with each other.

The specific items discussed by the Committee that relates to this area include the conservation works to Council owned heritage properties including Willandra and the landscape works to the curtilage of Brush Farm House.

Environment

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Environment (set out on page 69 of the Management Plan 2009-2013):

- E4 Strong links to the past through protection, conservation and interpretation of our heritage.

The specific items discussed by the Committee that relates to this area include the conservation works to council owned heritage properties including Brush Farm Curtilage and surrounds.

**ITEM 6 (continued)****Governance**

This project meets the following **key outcomes** for Governance (set out on page 79 of the Management Plan 2009-2013)

- G1 Improved awareness and understanding of Council's decisions by the community.
- G2 Members of the community are engaged in democratic decision making.
- G5 Compliance with all legislative requirements and statutory obligations.

The functions of the Committee meets this outcome.

**Financial Impact**

Adoption of the option(s) outlined in this report will have no financial impact.

**Policy Implications**

There are no policy implications through adoption of the recommendations.

**Other Options**

Not applicable.

**Conclusion**

Updates on key heritage initiatives undertaken by Council have been reported to the Committee.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the report of the Heritage Officer, dated 26/10/2009 on HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE - Minutes 04 / 09, be received and noted.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- 1 Heritage Advisory Committee - Minutes 26 October 2009 - 04/09

Report Prepared By:

**Garry Stanley**  
**Heritage Officer**

Report Approved By:

**Meryl Bishop**  
**Manager - Urban Planning**

**Dominic Johnson**  
**Group Manager Environment & Planning**

## ITEM 6 (continued)

## ATTACHMENT 1

## RYDE HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE 04/ 09

**DATE:** Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> . August 2009

**TIME:** 6.00 pm

**LOCATION:** Level 5 Civic Centre Ryde

**REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:**

## COUNCILLORS

Councillor Ivan Petch - **Chair**

Representing City of Ryde.

Councillor Pickering – **Chair from Minute No. 04**

Representing City of Ryde

Councillor Perram

Representing City of Ryde.

.

## COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Greg Blaxell

Community representative.

Mr. Patrick Sullivan

Community Representative.

Ms. Jennie Minifie

Representing the National Trust of Australia (NSW)

and the Ryde - Hunters Hill Flora and Fauna Preservation Society.

Dr. Peter Mitchell

Community Representative.

Mr. Richard Wright

Representing Ryde District Historical Society.

Ms. Eleanor Chaine

Community representative.

Ms. Rita Lapedjian

Community Representative

Mr. John Hull,

Representing Friends of the Hermitage

## COUNCIL STAFF

Mr. Dominic Johnson

Group Manager – Environment and Planning-  
City of Ryde

Ms. Angela Phippen

Local Studies Librarian – City of Ryde.

Mr. Garry Stanley

Heritage Officer – City of Ryde.

**ITEM 6 (continued)****ATTACHMENT 1****MIN No. 01 Welcome and Apologies.**

Councillor Vic Tagg, Mayor  
Representing City of Ryde.  
Councillor Salvestro-Martin  
Representing City of Ryde.  
Councillor Maggio  
Representing City of Ryde  
Ms. Jennifer Noble  
Representing Brush Farm Historical Society.  
Mr. Terry Ryan  
Community Representative.  
Mr. Peter Bardos  
Meadowbank West Ryde Progress Association  
Ms. Meryl Bishop  
Manager – Urban Planning – City of Ryde

**MIN No. 02 Consideration and adoption of minutes 02/09.**

The minutes of the meeting of 03/09 were adopted.

Margareta Grunberg notified Council on 10 August that she has not been nominated as representative of the Putney and District Progress Association. Margareta will no longer be a community representative of the Heritage Advisory Committee. The committee would like to thank Margareta for her contribution to the Committee.

**MIN No. 03 Denistone Character Area**

Patrick Sullivan expressed concern about the DA for 41 Buena Vista Ave. progressing as far as it did. External advice should have been referred to Weir and Philips rather than Architectus. Clear guidelines are needed for consultants at early stages of preparing a DA for work within the Character area.

Dominic Johnson compared the Denistone Character Area with Tyrell St. Character Area with its 20 pages of information and controls. Dominic said that the independent consultants also looked at shadow diagrams, and that the design was amended 4 times before the final determination was made. He noted that no submissions were made for the alterations to no. 39, determined before the establishment of the Character Area.

It was agreed that community sentiment has changed since the initial public meeting which lead to the creation of the Character Area. The first proposal was that it be a Conservation Area, but this was altered to create the Character area.

Patrick Sullivan stated that a document is needed that refers to what is acceptable and what is not acceptable. His objection to the proposal at no. 41 Buena Vista Ave. was the steepness of the slope and the height of the building above the street. Alternatives could have been considered which extended the house to the rear of the site maintaining the streetscape.

**ITEM 6 (continued)****ATTACHMENT 1**

There is not enough specificity about each property, but not suggesting that controls be tightened. There should be clear guidelines about what is acceptable and what is not. Number 39 could not be considered a precedent as it was approved before the character area was established. Some residents had been denied first floor additions before number 41. Patrick suggested that he would get together with some residents to formulate precedents. Greg Blaxell suggested that precedents should be established and that number 39 did not fit in.

Dominic Johnson stated that Council has resolved that the Housing Code does not apply to Character Areas but there has been no formal agreement from the Department of Planning. The Department does not favour conservation areas.

**MIN. No. 04 Brush Farm House Exhibition update.**

Garry Stanley reported that the exhibition has now been re-scheduled for the period Saturday 5 September to Sunday 13 September, with an opening on Friday evening 4 September. This period is History Week and it is proposed to open the exhibition 10 - 4 on the two weekends and 12 to 4 during the week. A final draft of the exhibition "From Land Grants to Suburbia", has been produced by MLC Powerhouse Design Studio, and it is ready for production and installation.

**MIN. No. 05 Brush Farm House Brochure update.**

Garry Stanley tabled the final design of the brochure, which is now ready for printing. The brochure is part of the Heritage Office Interpretation grant 2008-09 and includes plans of the house with dates for each section of construction and historic details of the names given to each room. On the outer cover the landscape concept is outlined. It is intended that the brochure will be available at the exhibition opening.

**MIN. No. 06 Royal Rehabilitation Centre update.**

Dominic Johnson tabled a letter from Department of Planning which stated that the Royal Rehabilitation Centre project is a State Significant Project and that the heritage significance had already been considered. The heritage buildings are not on the state register and the concept plan for the development of the site has been approved.

Councillor Pickering said that Council had no access to the site and it has been removed from Council's Planning considerations. Community needs to be galvanised to oppose the plan. The property cannot be simply be put on heritage schedule of LEP. It would require an exhaustive heritage study, and the support of the Minister.

Jennie Minifie said that there was a document which stated that the site has high social significance.

Greg Blaxell said that Council needs to be seen to be doing something. If something is not done the old buildings will just go, and it should be at least raised at Council, and possibly a peer review of the existing heritage study. The committee supported this suggestion.

**MIN No. 07 Hermitage Matter Judgement**

Garry Stanley read from the Land and Environment Court of New South Wales Judgement of 1 May 2009. Zaymill Proprietary Limited v Ryde City Council.

**ITEM 6 (continued)****ATTACHMENT 1**

Whether Development Consent for construction of dwellings had lapsed after five years.

Declaration was that development consent No. 1024/2001 issued by Ryde City Council on 11 October 2002 had not lapsed.

**MIN No. 08 Heritage Review 2008**

Garry Stanley reported that the draft heritage data sheets have been sent to Greg Blaxell, Eleanor Chaine, Peter Mitchell and Angela Phippen, with comments back by 1 September 09. Dominic Johnson changed the date to September 18 to give reviewers more time.

**MIN No. 09 Report from Community Representatives**Brush Farm Park

Jennie Minifie stated that there was nothing on the National Heritage List for Brush Farm House and Estate.

Britten made a series of recommendations in the Plan of Management including nomination for State Significance and National Significance which would be opportunities to attract funding.

Field of Mars Cemetery Gates

General enquiry about refurbishment of gates, Garry Stanley reported that he has had discussions with architect on the proposed gates.

Hermitage.

John Hull requested name of heritage Consultant looking after restoration work on the Hermitage Site, Garry Stanley to follow up.

Wharf marker

Richard Wright stated that the bi-centennial marker, concrete plinth and bronze plaque for the Ryde Wharf has now been placed and would like to congratulate all involved in this project.

Ryde Historical Society

The Arts Society had an open day at Willandra with a good response of visitors. A walk from St. Collin's to St. Anne's with 30 to 40 people in attendance.

**MIN. No. 10 General Business**Brush Farm House Business Plan update.

The plan was reported to Public Facilities and Services committee on 21 July 09, with the following recommendations:

- (a) That the report of the Arts and Cultural Development Co-ordinator dated 1/07/09 on Brush Farm House Business Plan, be received and noted.
- (b) That the business plan, 'Brush Farm House: Creativity in the Arts, Food and Wine' be endorsed and implemented.
- (c) That the 2010/2011 operating expenditure and revenue identified in Brush Farm House business plan be considered in the development of Council's Budget.

The recommendations were endorsed with no amendments.

**ITEM 6 (continued)****ATTACHMENT 1**

The full implementation of the business plan will take place from the 2010/11 financial year, when a staff position will be created to implement the plan. There is still no decision on the marquee DA.

NSW Housing Code – Exclusion Areas.

Council on the 2 July 09 resolved to apply to the Department of Planning to exclude the three character areas, Tyrell St., Trelawney St and Denistone, from the Housing Code. The documentation was lodged with the Department of Planning in June 09.

Willandra

Richard Wright reported that the floodlights at the Devlin St. entrance of Willandra need repairing, and all old fencing needs to be removed from site. Four lemon trees have been planted in front of the house, and branches on SW corner have been trimmed. It is intended that the fence be painted in the warmer weather, possibly early October.

Putney Park Plan of Management

Eleanor Chaine enquired if there was any heritage interpretation intended for the Plan of Management for Putney Park and requested that Garry Stanley follow up. Greg Blaxell stated that there was plenty of information about the park site that could be interpreted

Brush Farm Historical Society Update

Greg Blaxell reported on a number of the Society's activities including that;

- the Society will be participating in the Granny Smith Festival,
- the Guide Manual for Brush Farm House is completed,
- the Restoration Book of Brush Farm House is being edited by Gregory Blaxell,
- four of the eight room panels for installation in BFH have been made.
- membership of the Society has halved.

Electrical Substation, Denistone Character Area

Dominic Johnson stated that it will be relocated to the Park. Dominic will follow up with Vince Galletto.

History Week

Angela Phippen reported that there will be two talks during history week.

“Let us Break their Bonds” – talks from NSW Divorce Courts.

“Saturated with Filth and Corruption” – noxious trades in NSW.

Stone Markers

Peter Mitchell tabled his report Stone Boundary Markers within the City of Ryde. The report outlines the history of mile posts and alignment posts in early Sydney together with photographs at each site. The information will be used to prepare the Heritage Data Sheet on this item.

**ITEM 6 (continued)****ATTACHMENT 1**LEP 2008

Dominic Johnson reported that LEP 2008, went to the Department of Planning 7 August. The document is a translation of the old Ordinance into a modern document. Local strategies are being undertaken to move planning in the City of Ryde into the future.

Seidler House, Wicks Rd.

Jennie Minifie reported that the Cape Chestnut tree at the house will be replaced with an identical tree species.

**MIN NO. 11. Next Meeting:** 21 October 2009

Meeting Closed: 8.17PM

Actions	Responsible Officer	Completed
<b>Willandra</b> - contact the Technical Group from the Heritage Office regarding gravel at Willandra.	Council's Buildings and Property Unit (B & DU) and GS	
<b>Royal Rehabilitation Centre Sydney</b> - The potential heritage listing on the RSCC site be revisited.	MB	Reported to Council in May 2009
<b>Projects for the Committee –</b> Draft project plan prepared for the Committee	GS	
<b>Review of heritage Items and Potential Items</b> Identification of tasks the Committee could undertake to assist in undertaking the Heritage Review.	GS	
<b>Brush Farm Park PoM-</b> The Parks Unit is advised of the points raised by the Committee.	MB	Completed
<b>Brush Farm Estate –</b> Undertake research regarding expanding the area of the State listing of the Brush Farm Estate	GS	
<b>Ferry Trip-</b> ferry trip be a Council event and run by the Event Team is forwarded to the Manager Community Relations and Events.	MB	Completed

<b>ITEM 6 (continued)</b> <b>Actions</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>ATTACHMENT 1</b> <b>Completed</b>
<b>Ryde Foreshore Study</b> Council could explore asking Godden Mackay Logan to present the study and its findings to the HAC.	MB	
<b>Brush Farm Estate Terraces</b> - explore with the Heritage Office funding to research the terraces at Brush Farm Park.	GS	
<b>Brush Farm Park signage</b> – signage corrected to relate to the references to Ironbark & Brush Farm estate be forwarded to Manager Parks.	GS	Completed
<b>Denistone Character Area.</b> Council staff will contact Energy Australia to discuss an appropriate location of the kiosk.	MB	Completed
<b>National Trust</b> - Council respond to the issues raised in the National Trust's letter	MB	
<b>Brush Farm House Business Plan.</b> The committee is advised when the draft business Plan is presented to Council for exhibition. (anticipated date July / August)	MB	
<b>Stone Markers.</b> Dr. Peter Mitchell will work with Garry Stanley in the preparation of report on stone markers.	GS	Completed
<b>Heritage Data Sheets</b> The draft data sheets sent to the working group in sets with a time frame of six to eight weeks for feedback.	GS	Completed
<b>Denistone Character Area.</b> The committee requested that the committee's recommendations be circulated to all councillors prior to the next Committee of the Whole, 21 July 09		Completed
<b>Willandra</b> Advise Parks Unit re. floodlight repair and removal of old fencing.	GS	
<b>Putney Park Plan of Management</b> Heritage Interpretation to be included.	GS	