

Greenwich Community Association

General Meeting

Held at Greenwich Memorial Community Hall, 46 Greenwich Road, Greenwich
17 August 2016

Minutes of Meeting

The meeting opened at 7:35pm

Present: As per the attendance book

1) Welcome

President Merri Southwood chaired the meeting and welcomed community members. In addition, she welcomed two guests from the NSW Environment Protection Authority;

- David Gathercole, A/Director Metropolitan - Sydney Industry
- Jane Burgett, Snr Operations Officer Sydney Industry

2) Apologies

Apologies were received from Michael Ryland, Lizz Gill, Susan Robinson and the Greg Sheehy, A/Director Metropolitan EPA.

3) Confirmation of Minutes of previous general meeting 15 June 2016

The minutes of the GCA General Meeting held 15 June 2016 were tabled.

Motion: The previous meeting's minutes are accepted.

Moved by Tom Gervay, seconded by Liz Walton and passed.

4) Matters arising from the Minutes

The History of the Greenwich Community Association's book launch held in the afternoon of 30 July, was a resounding success. The works by the late John May, completed and published by wife Celia and Jill Pain, were celebrated by a gathering of over 50 community members, including MPs Anthony Roberts and Trent Zimmerman. An e-copy of the book has been made available on the GCA website. Hard copies are being distributed to the local branches of the Lane Cove library and are available for purchase via Celia May.

Any other matters arising from the minutes were discussed during the meeting.

5) Report on the Activities of the Association

a) President's Report

The President commented that it had again been a busy period. In addition to the GCA History book launch, it has included further local Council merger activities and submissions to the JRPP for Loftex's Marshall Ave development and the Legislative Council's Inquiry into Crown Lands. Several sub-committees will report later in the meeting regarding their activities.

b) Secretary's Report

Since the General Meeting held 15 June 2016 the following correspondence has been received:

Date	From	Subject
16 June 2016	Joint Regional Planning Panel	Notice of Panel Meeting DA 205/2015 1-13 Marshall Ave, St Leonards
27 June 2016	Lane Cove Council	(email) Consideration to be given to GCA's Open Space Plan Submission
29 June 2016	Hon Paul Toole MP Minister for Local Government	Response to GCA Proposal re: East Ward amalgamation with LGA incl. St Leonards
11 July 2016	Lane Cove Council	Notice of Determination for DA205/15 1-13 Marshall Ave (Loftex Tower)
Week of 15 July 2016 and that following	Various residents and other invited guests	RSVP to John May's GCA History Book Launch
26 July 2016	Hon Paul Toole MP Minister for Local Government	Acknowledgement of GCA response MP comment on GCA Proposal re: East Ward amalgamation
27 July 2016	Lane Cove Bushcare	Golden Whistler – Winter newsletter
28 July 2016	Ausgrid	Notification that Street Light Report for 46 Greenwich Road had been addressed.
4 August 2016	Hon Anthony Roberts MP	Auto acknowledgement of GCA request to support its Proposal for East Ward amalgamation with St Leonards

4 August 2016	Lane Cove Bushland and Conservation Society	Invitation to attend meeting featuring Greater Sydney Commission presentation
7 August 2016	Hon Trent Zimmerman MP	Acknowledgement of GCA request to support its Proposal for East Ward amalgamation with St Leonards
8 August 2016	Greater Sydney Commission	Information Pack – key changes and re-direction
10 August 2016	NSW Environment Protection Agency	Confirmed intention to attend August GCA Meeting
10 August 2016	Lane Cove Council	Acknowledgement of request for Walking Track and Unmade Road map.

The following correspondence has been sent:

Date	To	Subject
22 June 2016	Lane Cove City Council	GCA Submission regarding LCC's draft Open Space Plan
29 June 2016	Joint Regional Planning Panel	GCA Submission to JRPP DA 205/2015 1-13 Marshall Ave, St Leonards
29 June 2016	NSW Environment Protection Authority	Minutes of Meeting between EPA and GCA 31 May 2016 Review of Submissions for Licence 661; Viva Energy Gore Bay Terminal, Greenwich
15 July 2016	Various residents and other invited guests	John May's GCA History Book Launch
18 July 2016	Lane Cove Council	Request for Map of Walking Track and Unmade Roads and Maintenance Schedule
18 July 2016	Ausgrid	Street Light Report for 46 Greenwich Road
18 July 2016	Ausgrid	Street Light Report for Lower Serpentine Rd - Greenwich

		Wharf stairs
24 July 2016	NSW Legislative Council	GCA Submission – Council’s Inquiry into Crown Lands General Purpose Standing Committee No. 6
27 July 2016	John Taylor	Cheque for web hosting services
27 July 2016	Celia May	Cheque for printing GCA History
4 August 2016	Hon Anthony Roberts MP	Thank you for attending Book Launch and request to support its Proposal for East Ward amalgamation with St Leonards
4 August 2016	Hon Trent Zimmerman MP	Thank you for attending Book Launch and request to support its Proposal for East Ward amalgamation with St Leonards
10 August 2016	NSW Environment Protection Agency	Invitation to attend and report at August GCA Meeting
10 August 2016	Lane Cove Council	Follow-up re: request for Map and Maintenance Schedule of Walking Tracks and Unmade Roads
13 August 2016	NSW Ministry of Health	(GIPA) Access Application for material associated with Health’s assessment of draft HHRA for Gore Bay Terminal and SSD 5148.

c) Treasurer’s Report

The Treasurer addressed the meeting and advised that whilst the Cash Book balance remained over \$5,000, the account was heading for a small loss/profit for FY 2016. A membership (subscription) drive is required, similar to that of previous years. Greenwich Village Games Chairman, Sandy Calder, has been approached and agreed to the GCA manning a table (shaded by a tent) at this year’s Games. The GCA’s actions and activities over the past year will be visible, including the Newsletter, Website, Local Council petition and other Submissions. Payment will be applicable to the 2017 year. A focus will be made on obtaining email addresses to improve the Associations communication efforts with its members.

The following figures were presented, as at 2 August, 2016;

1. SUBSCRIPTIONS to date for 2016

Total no. of subscriptions 174 individuals or families (135 as of June 15th)

2. CURRENT TRADING – 1.01.16 to 02.08.16

Gross Income	\$3,277.64
Total Expenses	\$2,873.99
Net Income	\$403.65

3. OPERATING FUNDS as at 02.08.2016

Bank Account Balance	\$5,048.43
Cash Book Balance	\$5,048.43
Term deposit rolled 19.4.16	\$12,331.28

4. BALANCE SHEET – refer attached

Total assets for GCA as at 02.08.16	\$17,379.71
--	--------------------

No unusual expenditure; Newsletter, reimbursements and GCA History book Launch.

Motion: That the Treasurer's report be accepted.

Moved by Liz Walton, seconded by Rod Tudge and passed.

6) Notified Business

a) EPA Licence 661; Gore Bay Terminal - Viva Energy

Jane Burgett and David Gathercole of the EPA addressed the meeting. David started out by advising that amendments to Licence 661 had been made and would be published on the Public Register (via EPA website) the following day. In addition to the GCA' submission, 17 resident submissions were made regarding the review of this Licence. A guiding principle used by the EPA during the licence renewal process was that all conditions (new or amended) need to be legally enforceable and unambiguous. The minutes of the GCA meeting with the EPA of 31/5/2016 were used as a basis for the remaining discussion.

1. Petrol Storage

- Whilst emphasising that the EPA is sure that Viva has no intention to store petrol at the site and would accept a "no MoGas" (industry jargon for ULP) condition, the licence cannot be amended to reflect this definitively, due legislative limitations.
- The EPA stated 2 reasons as to why there are limits; i. the licence's Scheduled Activity is "petroleum products storage" and ii. Viva has "existing use rights". The Authority cannot cherry pick out the site's usage for petrol storage and the only way around this would be to convince the Minister to amend the schedule to exclude petrol.

- The EPA is not able to advocate for legislative amendment on behalf of the community, despite further observation of Viva's stance and poor attitude.
- The licence will require Viva to give 90 days' notice before storing unleaded petrol at the terminal. The 90 days has been chosen as that is the minimum time Viva would need to place a forward order for delivery of petrol for storage at Gore Bay.
- The tanks at Gore Bay are not to a standard required to store petrol. Viva would need to notify the terminal as a Major Hazard Facility to SafeWork before it could store and that SafeWork would be responsible for checking tank suitability. The EPA believes tank modifications could need a DA.
- Jane Burgett, who is the current EPA Operations Manager responsible for Gore Bay, stated she will be working closely with Michelle Stromquist from SafeWork and they plan to do joint inspections.

2. Noise Monitoring

- The Licence will now require Viva to continuously monitor noise levels and report the data on a register accessible to the public. In practice, Viva will send the audio to the EPA who will review on our behalf and then publish or authorise Viva to post to a public website.
- There will be only one noise monitoring point specified. Viva used to voluntarily monitor from two points in the days when they knew they did not have to report on a public register but they have now nominated just one point, being behind the Guard House.
- The EPA is still in discussions around the time lag between recording and reporting and how the data will be presented on the public register. Tonal variations may not be specifically covered in the amended condition wording.

3. Emissions Monitoring

- The EPA has inserted a new condition requiring Viva to investigate the feasibility of installing an emissions monitoring system on the site boundary in accordance with US EPA standards.
- The intention is that the monitoring will be of PAH and VRC levels only as they are the indicators of underlying emissions of other compounds. The EPA is still negotiating with Viva as to whether there will be links to legislative limits. No guidance on timing of a continuous monitoring installation was provided.

4. Fit and proper person

- This was discussed extensively. The EPA does not go into the financial capacity of the licence holder to run the operation as required or to compensate in the event of incidents at the terminal. They merely check that there has been no NSW based prosecutions of the operator and/or key personnel under environmental legislation and a check on the ASIC register as to registration status and officers.

5. Vessels

- There will be no new licence condition on this aspect as the EPA says it lacks authority. It was confirmed that the EPA is the appropriate regulatory for pilotage vessels but it is very difficult to prosecute.
- It was also confirmed that the recent amendments to federal legislation effectively override the recent NSW sulfur regulations although cruise lines seem to be voluntarily limiting the levels on vessels in the harbour.

6. Complaints Line Signage

- Whilst the licence has not been varied to address specifically, Jane said that she was pushing Viva hard on putting up adequate signage and will continue to do so. Viva has reportedly agreed to do this. She could not understand why the previous signage had been taken down.

7. Emergency Management

- Concern was expressed to the EPA representatives about the continued impasse re emergency management. Jane Burgett said that the GB Terminal site was unique worldwide. It was also explained that lack of specific detail was due to strategic importance of facility and security implications. Continued discussion with relevant authorities was recommended.

8. Pipeline (Gore Bay to Clyde)

- Jane B confirmed that the responsible authority for the pipeline is SafeWork. This was news to us as the last we understood was that SafeWork was not sure.

Merri thanked both Jane and David for their time and the GCA now looks forward to reviewing the EPA's Licence 661 amendments.

b) John May's GCA History book launch

This was addressed earlier.

c) Walking Tracks & Unmade Roads

Council responded to our letter with copy of the Bushwalks Around Lane Cove. Council also suggested that a project, requiring funding, may be required to produce the requested information. No comment was offered regarding the signage and/or maintenance aspects of such tracks and roads. It was agreed that a follow-up would be made.

d) Loftex's Marshall Avenue JRPP decision and appeal considerations

Albert and Anita Jubian addressed the meeting. A review of the Joint Regional Planning Panel's hearing and decision of June 29 was provided for DA 205/2015 1-13 Marshall Ave, St Leonards. At issue were the following observations;

- Technical issues with the DA's total height and FSR requirements were given only minor consideration by the JRPP. This was despite studies showing there were wind and traffic issues.
- Council's deliberations and positioning with the developer (Loftex) at the meeting. The LCC had wanted the approval prior 30 June to meet a raft of financial reasons driven by the developer.
- Many good submissions were made objecting to the development and/or aspects of the LEP. Appearance that the JRPP were unwilling to consider any of the submissions and thus had a pre-determined outcome.

Consideration by the meeting was made as to whether an appeal should be made. Grounds for an appeal are considered to exist given there may have been procedural flaws in the JRPP's

decision making process. Further review of these grounds will be pursued. Despite this, it was noted that the GCA is not suitably resourced to pursue an appeal.

e) Council Amalgamation – status report

The Land and Environment Court has several Council amalgamation matters before it, including that of LCC. Woollahra Council is appealing a recent verdict that sided with the State Government. Hunters Hill is on record stating that any adverse finding will be appealed. Meanwhile we await a requested meeting with the Minister for Local Government to discuss the East Ward's (Greenwich) proposal to be included with any LGA including St Leonards.

f) Greater Sydney Commission – report

g) Lighting at Greenwich Wharf and Community Centre – report

Residents have expressed concern regarding the poor lighting around the uneven stairs and/or steep paths at both areas. A report was filed with AusGrid who have attended to and fixed the light on the Community Centre grounds.

The poor lighting issue up Mitchell Road, from Greenwich Wharf is not a new issue, previous attempts having been made by residents and Councillor Palmer to improve the situation. At issue is the lack of a light post(s), however the installation of any new post(s) would be on private property and have not been agreed to. As AusGrid only has the maintenance contract for the lighting network, the GCA will write to Council to re-visit what solutions may exist.

h) Greenwich Greenway

Peter Tiffin addressed the meeting, on behalf of the Bicycle and Active Transport sub-committee. It was advised that the NSW State Government has approved \$3 million in funding to scope a Green Grid across Sydney. The grid would link suburbs and precincts through open spaces and nature reserves. Local resident Rod Simpson, the recently appointed Environment Commissioner of Greater Sydney Commission could be approached. In particular, the application for another pedestrian crossing between Greenwich Road and Shirley Road, utilising a portion of trackside reserve could be made. Questions raised included what budgets are available and would VPAs linkage be made to such works? This would be further discussed within the Bicycle and Active Transport sub-committee.

i) Photos on GCA website

As a way to improve website traffic, it has been suggested that photos from community events and living could be displayed on a monthly or quarterly frequency. On any update, subscribers would be notified. The use of photos depicting people and/or children would be subject to obtaining their permission. John Taylor (GCA's web administrator) will draft suitable (permission) wording and he, along with local artists (?) could judge which photos are displayed should there be a competition or large volumes. Alternatively, a Photo sub-committee could be established.

j) GCA Submission to Legislative Council Inquiry into Crown Land

The GCA Committee had previously resolved to make a submission to the Legislative Council's Inquiry into Crown Land. In being aware that community members were making submissions on

specific usage of certain Crown Lands, the GCA presented a position that looked at the linkage between the Act and its interpretation locally by Lane Cove Council.

A copy of the Submission is provided in Appendix A;

7) Report of Subcommittees

a) Bicycle and Active Transport Sub-Committee

Refer 6) g) Greenwich Greenway above.

b) Gore Bay Terminal Sub-Committee

In addition to that discussed in Notified Business, the meeting was advised;

- Our informal request to obtain NSW Health's notes on the draft Human Health Risk Assessment was rebuffed. We have thus proceeded with a formal GIPA request of the Agency's internal notes / assessment of the draft HHRA.
- Our contact at National Toxics Network is able to assist in reviewing the HHRA but would require a well-defined scope. Such a scope could be provided by Dr. Arthur Chesterfield-Evans, assuming less demands on his time now that the Federal Election has passed.

8) Councillor's Report

There was no Report provided.

9) General Business

a) Local author Paul Brickhill

Dennis Smith brought to the meeting's attention that local resident Stephen Dando-Collins, historian and biographer would be conducting a book launch at Lane Cove Library, connected with his recent work "*The Hero Maker: A Biography of Paul Brickhill*". Stephen traces the life story of one of Australia's most successful and contradictory writers, Paul Brickhill who transformed himself from a stuttering copy-boy to become an ace reporter. After being shot down as a RAF pilot in WWII, he was made a German POW and held in Stalag Luft 3, where *The Great Escape* took place. Other of Paul's titles were: *Dam Busters* and *Reach for the Skies*.

Stephen's session will be held September 1 at 6.15pm.

10) Close

The meeting closed at 9.45pm.

Next General Meeting 19 October 2016.

Appendix A – GCA Submission to General Legislative Council Inquiry into Crown Lands



Greenwich Community Association Inc

**SUBMISSION TO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
INQUIRY INTO CROWN LAND
General Purpose Standing Committee No 6**

24 July 2016

Standing of Greenwich Community Association Inc

The Greenwich Community Association (GCA) is an incorporated association Y2838547. It has offered community members a forum to express their views since 1944 and has, as required, articulated community concerns to relevant authorities.

A resolution was passed at a committee meeting of the GCA on 4 July 2016 authorising the GCA to make a submission to this inquiry.

The GCA thanks the Legislative Council for this opportunity to make a submission. A representative of the GCA is able to appear before hearings of the Inquiry if required to do so.



Meredith Southwood
President
Greenwich Community Association Inc
southwood@bigpond.com
0412 361331

24 July 2016

Overview

Crown land is a community asset that should be protected.

The Crowns Land Act (the Act) clearly articulates the principles to be applied in respect of crown land administration and management by trustees. The Act is unambiguous in respect of use and access, application of funds derived from use of the land and commercial use of the land.

It is understood that Crown Lands Division of the Department of Primary Industry (DPI) has administrative oversight of compliance with the provisions of the Act.

If a trustee elects to ignore the statutory obligations applicable to it, the community has a right to expect that the DPI will take steps to ensure compliance.

It appears that there are instances in which the DPI may not be doing this and the value to the community of crown land may be eroded as a consequence.

In the event that the DPI is unable to ensure strict compliance with the objectives of the Act, the GCA seeks legislative amendments to ensure that all parcels of crown land and conditions attaching thereto are clearly identifiable on a public register, that trustees are adequately monitored for compliance with their statutory responsibilities and that commercial use of the land is consistent with the principles of the Act.

Crown Land holdings of Lane Cove Council

The suburb of Greenwich is located in the Lane Cove Council (LCC) LGA.

The area is characterised by harbour foreshore and extensive bushland areas.

LCC has advised that there is approx 27 ha of Crown Land within LCC LGA, noting that there is approx 150ha of total public open and private open space in the LGA. In this respect, it is noted that DPI is not able to supply a list of crown land holdings in the LCC LGA for verification.

Lane Cove Council Management of Crown Land

Despite the statutory restrictions and obligations pertaining to Crown Land under its control, aspects of LCC's management of crown land suggest that it regards itself as owner of the land that it controls, rather than as trustee under the Act.

This is evidenced by:-

1. failure to separately identify in its open space/community land strategies those parcels of land that are subject to crown land conditions
2. failure to identify, during consultation processes, the parcels of land that are subject to crown land conditions and to identify what those conditions are
3. failure to consult around commercial use of crown land
4. failure to separately identify in accounts the income derived from crown land.

It seems that LCC is able to manage crown land as it has because there is minimal oversight of its adherence to its obligations by the DPI.

The Trust Handbook that has been uploaded to the website of the DPI

http://www.crownland.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/652093/Reserve_Trust_Handbook.pdf

is, to all intents and purposes, a statement of objectives only that has limited impact in terms of the DPI's enforcement of crown land legislation and in terms of the conduct of LCC as trustee.

The inquiry has or will receive a separate submission in respect of the LCC's management as trustee of the Greenwich Baths which provides examples of the possible failure of the DPI to ensure compliance by LCC with its obligations under the terms of the Act and under the relevant trust instruments governing the Baths.

This submission addresses the specific terms of reference overleaf.

Terms of reference

(a) the extent of Crown land and the benefits of active use and management of that land to New South Wales

It is assumed that the area of crown land administered by LCC is as advised by LCC. Much of the land under this tenure is foreshore land or recreational space that greatly enhances the quality of life in an area close to the CBD. The areas held as crown land enhance both physical and psychological wellbeing of users.

The value to the community of access to crown land along foreshore areas in Lane Cove cannot be over-estimated, given the encroachment of development into public spaces in other parts of Sydney Harbour.

The Foreword on page 1 of the Trust Handbook makes the statement that "*we are fortunate in New South Wales to have around 35,000 Crown reserves that provide a wide range of experiences and activities as well as many other significant environmental and cultural benefits, for the entire community*".

Onerous charges, rigorous conditions or limitations around access and/or commercial use arrangements risk effective loss to the public of the benefits of crown land. It is understood that trustees, in most cases, councils, need to fund the cost of ongoing maintenance of reserves under their control. In the absence of significant public funding for this purpose, it may be necessary for trustees to secure a financial return from crown land to fulfil their obligations as trustees. However, the principles of crown land management are clear in this regard:-

11 Principles of Crown land management

For the purposes of this Act, the principles of Crown land management are:

- (a) that environmental protection principles be observed in relation to the management and administration of Crown land,*
- (b) that the natural resources of Crown land (including water, soil, flora, fauna and scenic quality) be conserved wherever possible,*
- (c) that public use and enjoyment of appropriate Crown land be encouraged,*
- (d) that, where appropriate, multiple use of Crown land be encouraged,*
- (e) that, where appropriate, Crown land should be used and managed in such a way that both the land and its resources are sustained in perpetuity, and*
- (f) that Crown land be occupied, used, sold, leased, licensed or otherwise dealt with in the best interests of the State consistent with the above principles.*

GCA Submission

1. The Department of Primary Industries must review its protocols to ensure that acts of trustees are, at all times, assessed against the principles of management outlined in the Act.
2. Approval by the DPI of all leases, licences, development applications and other agreements (third party arrangements) between trustees and third parties should be detailed on a public register and include a statement that the DPI has assessed and approved the third party arrangement in terms of the principles of Section 11.

(b) the adequacy of community input and consultation regarding the commercial use and disposal of Crown land

The comments of the GCA in respect of this term of reference are limited to use, not disposal, of crown land.

It is assumed that the term "commercial use" relates to use by a trustee or a third party in agreement with a trustee to operate a commercial venture/ profit making enterprise on crown land.

In this respect, the GCA is not aware of any circumstance in which LCC, as trustee, has formally sought community input and consultation regarding the commercial use of crown land in the Greenwich area.

Commercial use by trustee

In the event that a trustee elects to manage crown land in its own right and to operate on that land, in its own right, a commercial venture such a snack bar, any charge to enjoy use of the crown land should, consistent with principals with Section 11 (c) and (d), be kept to a minimum required to allow the trustee to cover its costs associated with the management of the land.

Any profit derived from commercial activity should be appropriately disclosed in terms of the Act and disbursed in accordance with the Act.

Crown land entrusted to a trustee should not be a revenue source for a trustee with no obligation to return funds back to the crown asset.

Commercial use by third parties

It most cases it is understood that trustees of crown land may need to "outsource" some of their obligations in respect of crown land for one or more of the following reasons:-

1. lack of manpower resources to carry out ongoing management obligations
2. lack of funding to carry out obligations
3. that the maximisation of the benefits of the features of the reserve may be better achieved through management by a third party
4. that the land provides a trustee with the opportunity to offer facilities/land to community/special interest groups.

Ideally, the rules and protocols surrounding the commercial use of crown land should be covered in negotiated plans of management of assets as contemplated in Part 5 Division 6 of the Act. However, in the case of LCC, very few such plans exist. In the absence of such plans and in the absence of any amending legislation to cover consultation around commercial use, it is assumed that Chapter 14 of the Trust Handbook and the terms of the Act provide the benchmark against which commercial use must be assessed.

It is understood that it will probably be necessary to offer a commercial incentive for a third party to take on management of crown land. It is also understood that the details of the commercial arrangements between the trustee and the third party should, rightly, be treated as confidential.

Commercial arrangements will generally require consent of DPI and, as suggested in our first submission, the community has a right to expect that DPI should ensure that such commercial arrangements will not erode the objectives of Section 11, particularly sub-sections (c) (d) and (f).

In some cases, the proposed commercial use will require assessment of a development application under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act during which community members will have the opportunity to express their views on the merits of the development application. However, the authority assessing the development application has no power to concern itself with matters that fall under the Crown Lands Act.

It is hoped that the DPI, when alerted to community concerns around a development application, would be pro-active in terms of assessing a proposal against Section 11. However, in the case of the Greenwich Baths development application for a liquor licence referred to earlier in this submission, DPI showed no regard for concerns as to lease conditions expressed by the community in terms of Section 11 of the Act nor did it make a submission to the development application assessing authority in relation the requirements of Section 11.

GCA Submission

1. There should be community input and consultation regarding the commercial use and disposal of crown land.
2. The DPI has not demonstrated that it has the resources/capacity to ensure that proposals for commercial use meet the principles of Section 11.
3. A legislative amendment in isolation to require community input and consultation in respect of proposed commercial use may be of limited effect for the following reasons:-
 - (a) trustees may elect to proceed with negotiation of agreements without input and consultation despite such legislation, or
 - (b) in respect of those transactions that will require DPI approval, it is likely that prevailing capacity limitations within DPI will impede the capacity of the DPI to ensure that such requirements are satisfied.
4. The Act to be amended to require that individual Plans of Management be prepared for each parcel of crown land in NSW and to be adopted by the Minister. The Act may make provision for a Plan of Management to cover more than one parcel of crown land with Ministerial consent.
5. The Act to require that such Plans of Management include mandatory community input and consultation in relation to proposed commercial use of crown land.
6. The Act to require a trustee to give public notice of proposed commercial use of crown land in a manner similar to notification of development applications.
7. The Act to provide that agreements/arrangements/ leases relating to commercial use will be of no effect unless the trustee provides to DPI details of appropriate public notification, evidence of due consideration of objections and other input of the community and a statement that the transaction satisfies the requirements of Section 11 of the Act.
8. All such agreements/ arrangements/ leases to be noted on a public register administered by DPI.

(c) The most appropriate and effective measures for protecting Crown land so that it is preserved and enhanced for future generations

The GCA affirms its previous statements as to the value of crown land to the community and the environment. Unfortunately, like many government authorities, the DPI does not appear to have the capacity to ensure adequate oversight of the management of crown land.

Those with responsibility, as trustees, to manage crown land need to be resourced to perform their duties adequately and this may involve devolving management to a third party. The challenge is to provide a balance between providing commercial incentives to encourage a trustee or third party to manage the crown land whilst, at the same time, ensuring that the community is able to enjoy use of the land consistent with the terms of its relevant grant.

Trustees may choose to treat crown land as, to all intents and purpose, their own land – it makes life less complicated. However, crown land is a community asset and the community should be offered and take up the opportunity to be more involved in the management of these valuable assets to ensure that they remain in public ownership and that management is consistent with the principles of Section 11.

GCA Submission

1. DPI should place on its website an easily accessed register of all crown land in NSW.
The register should include the following:-
 - (a) Address of the land
 - (b) Name by which land is commonly known eg Greenwich Baths
 - (c) Link to documentation that details the conditions attached to the crown grant/reserve/copy of such document
 - (d) Name of the trustee
 - (e) Details of commercial arrangements/lease etc (as outlined in the previous submission) pertaining to the land.
2. Trustee of crown land to be audited annually for compliance with duties to list crown land separately from its own assets and to provide separate financial records relating to the crown land.
3. The detail in (2) above to be available on an easily accessed register administered by the trustee.
4. Mandatory Plans of Management as detailed in items 4 -10 of our previous submission.

(d) The extent of Aboriginal Land Claims over Crown land and opportunities to increase Aboriginal involvement in the management of Crown land

The GCA acknowledges the importance of this element of the Inquiry but lacks the information and resources to make a submission in respect of this term of reference.