

Mr Clive Ringler objects to Currawong proposed development and supports the heritage listing of the site because it is a significant Aboriginal site. The proposal should be rejected and the site purchased by the State Government.

Mr John Newlinds OAM and Mrs Mary Newlinds OAM, users of Currawong, believe there is little justification for the current proposal. There are many reasons for the Panel to reject the proposal and to confirm the listing of the site by the Heritage Council. They object to the proposed overdevelopment and believe the principles of ecologically sustainable development must be adhered to in considering the application. Of particular concern is the loss of Currawong to future generations which is inconsistent with the principle of Intergenerational Equity. Other concerns include increased flooding due to climate change, bushfire risk, potential demand for a road through the national park.

The existing low cost waterfront holiday retreat adjacent to Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park is of great value to Sydney residents. Its heritage environmental and social values must remain unchanged. Sydney and future generations need this place to be preserved by its addition to Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park.

Mr Scott Ingram supports the Heritage Council's recommendation to heritage list Currawong and opposes the current proposed development. There are a number of reasons why the proposed development should be rejected including the detrimental effect to the sensitive ecology of Currawong and the adjacent Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park from waste water disposal, planting of exotic vegetation, weed invasion, domestic pets. Other concerns include traffic, parking, boat mooring, loss of recreation area. The Panel should support the recommendation for heritage listing and reject the current application for development of the site.

Mr Julian Pulvermacher submitted that Currawong is part of the natural environment and heritage of all Australians. Children have benefited immeasurably from the unstructured simplicity offered by Currawong. He also addressed issues such as ownership and responsibilities of ownership including respecting the land, the social responsibility of the Labour Council which places a great fiduciary obligation to act with integrity, courage, trust and honour. Currawong must be preserved as part of public heritage and incorporated into Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park.

Pittwater Council on 19 May 2008 resolved to generally endorse the submission objecting to the proposed development and supporting the heritage listing of the site on the State Heritage Register. Council pointed out that its policy is no further subdivision on the western foreshores and no development at Currawong Beach that would compromise the sites cultural and natural heritage values. Council's submission also includes technical reports on water management, flooding & ocean processes, geotechnical evaluation, traffic, access, parking & emergency management & access, waste management & disposal, and bushfire. These reports detail Council's concern on issues relating to heritage, water management, coastal process and climate change, creek line management, other water related matters, geotechnical hazard, access and parking, construction management, emergency management, disability access, environmental impacts, post construction waste management and bushfire hazard.

Council also raised its concern about presentation time allocated to Pittwater Council and the proponent at the panel hearing. Given the different expert opinions on the geotechnical and coastal process issues, Council recommended independent expert advice be sought. The development proposal includes land outside the freehold and has not received the Department of Lands' consent nor has it been subject of appropriate assessment. Council also requested that if changes are to be made to the proposal, the Council and the community should be advised immediately.

Mr Rick Munnings objects to the impact of this development on Pittwater and the associated infrastructure problems. A large scale development would be an eyesore.

Ms Louise Mitchell submitted that Currawong should not be developed on the grounds of heritage significance and the environment. Ms Mitchell stated that she and her family have stayed at Currawong on a number of occasions and enjoyed the communal and social side of Currawong. The proposal for subdivision and private title will significantly change the character of the place and would make it rather like a small hotel or gated village complex. The promises and commitments are very vague and hardly an assurance. Currawong is a unique post-war resort for working families. The collective and cooperative character will be lost forever if it is to be developed as proposed. Currawong deserves to be saved.

Ms Susan Hoppe referred to her earlier letter to the Heritage Council supporting the listing of the whole of the Currawong on the State Heritage Register and her strong objection to the proposed development. The significance of the site has been recognised by the Heritage Council and the National Trust. Issues of concern include heritage, scale and type of proposed development, car access, car parking, water access, impacts on flora and fauna, construction impacts, potential fire hazards, water supply runoff and sewerage disposal. The Panel is urged to reject this proposal.

Ms Wendy Alyward objects to the proposed subdivision and development of Currawong. The proposal will cause a lot of damage to the environment and the site is dangerous for the extra people as they will be on their own in bushfire, floods, medical emergencies. The site should be returned to public ownership as part of Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park.

Mr Gary Oughtred and Mrs Helena van de Linde, Avalon residents, wish to secure the future of Currawong and ensure it is not further developed with new buildings.

Eco Villages Australia Pty Ltd submitted that in considering the heritage significance of Currawong, the Panel should take into account the key differences in expert opinions about the symbolic strength of Currawong as a physical expression of the Workers holiday camp movement and post-war social reforms. The Vandyke cabins as a physical expression of a relationship between the unions, innovative industrialists and post-war reconstruction ideals and the relative importance of the remnant early "Holiday Camp" character of the cabins and the site as a whole. It recommends that the final statement of significance should not place undue emphasis on the level of Labour Movement related symbolism ascribed to the physical fabric of Currawong and the surviving cabins and the informal vacation character should not be romanticised as a tactic to freeze the ongoing evolution of the cultural landscape. It also noted that the listing of Currawong on the SHR does not prohibit development on the land.

As to the proposed development, the submission focused on a number of key issues including building location and height, architectural character; visual impact; European heritage; traffic and parking; geotechnical; flooding and coastal processes; waste water management; ecology and vegetation; marine ecology – sea grass and bushfire management.

In response to issues raised in the submission to the project application, Eco Villages submitted a preferred project report to the Panel for its consideration. The key changes proposed in the report include 3.32ha to be dedicated to the national park, 7.17ha to be community nature reserve, 6.62ha common open space, 0.68ha foreshore land accessible by the public; the nine cabins will be retained as a single entity; residential zoned area will be reduced from 4.35ha to 2.72ha. Other changes are related to sensitive development, protection of heritage values, protection of significant ecological values, reinstatement of salt marsh, providing bushfire asset protection zone, re-align the existing residential zoned boundary.

Ms Patricia Giles OAM, Deputy Mayor, Pittwater Council, presented the community's special interest in the retention of Currawong as a heritage site and it must not be sold off to developers who have no interest in the wider community. Currawong is a wonderful example of a 1930's holiday camp for workers. The site will be affected by sea level rise and there is no sewerage system. Parking is a major problem. The NPWS will not take on the geologically challenged escarpment unless it is the whole package. The Panel should listen to the community and protect Currawong for now and the future.

Mrs Susan and Mr Robert Colvin support the Heritage Council listing Currawong on the State Heritage Register. Currawong has a long history as a holiday venue for working families in New South Wales. The buildings, bush and beach should all be protected by listing on the State Heritage Register as a matter of urgency. Mrs Colvin believes that being a 3rd generation Pittwater resident allows her to speak with passion about how they feel about the preservation of Currawong. She pointed out that notwithstanding the project application by Eco Villages, Currawong is still owned by the Union. There are many reasons to oppose the sale of the land to private developers and to support the rejection of the proposal such as parking and no access for building materials. Mrs Colvin, also representing the Narrabeen North Business Community Group, advised that the Group unanimously passed a motion to seek to preserve Currawong, to reject any proposed development on the site, and to support a delegation to request that the State and Federal Governments act to purchase the site for the peoples of Australia and incorporate it into the Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park.

Mr Harvey Rose, Pittwater Residents against Inappropriate Development (PRAID), believes that the community of Pittwater is united in their objection to the proposed development at Currawong. The principal

two reasons to oppose the proposal are the Currawong site should be heritage listed and the mainland infrastructure is inadequate to justify considering such a development. The proposal is an inappropriate development as it is not in harmony with the environment and not supported by the majority of the community. Any additional development in the area will put pressure on the demand to construct a road through the national park. The proposal is not for common good and is for profit for a minority.

PRAID passed several motions at a public meeting on 18 March 2008 including to support the listing on the State Heritage Register, to ask the State government to buy the site and include it in the national park and to approach the CFMEU to place a green ban on the site if approved for development.

Ms Ann Hinds, as a founding member of the Avalon Preservation Trust and PRAID, submitted that Currawong should be kept intact as a complete unit. Subdividing it into portions will deny the inter-relationship of the escarpment, the floodplain, the creek, the salt marsh and the beach. A number of concerns with the proposed development are raised including length of construction period and associated impacts such as noise, acid sulphate soils, impact on the adjoining national park, bushfire, and domestic animals. There are specific problems in the event the proposal goes ahead including the preservation of the heritage significance of the existing cottages, control over new buildings, mainland parking and building management. Ms Hinds also questioned who would supervise compliance if the application was given conditional approval by the Minister. The panel should recommend to the Minister that the proposed development be refused and Currawong be returned to public ownership.

Mr David Boulton is a user of Currawong from its earliest days and his family had spent their holidays there over the years. He asked the developer to consider water availability, adequacy of parking at Palm Beach, adequacy of effluent disposal and availability of electricity before contemplating any development proposal. Mr Boulton believes that Currawong should be incorporated into Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park.

Ms Toni Warburton believes Currawong is a recreational gem in the assets of the workers of NSW. The NSW Trade and Labour Council claimed the sale would fund the campaign and legal battle against new Federal labour laws. Ms Warburton believes there are better ways to do that. The sale is not in the National interest or the interests of workers. It is inconsistent with one of the fundamental principles of trade unionism that proclaims quality of life as a fundamental worker's right. The NSW Labour Council has a moral responsibility to honour the spirit and intention of the original donation and if sold a condition of sale should be that Currawong must remain in public hands.

Ms Gabrielle Grimbacher submitted that it does matter if houses will be built or not. The community does not want more houses on the western shore. Residents don't want to look at houses; they want to look at bush. She asked not to spoil and wreck what belongs to Pittwater.

Ms Margie Morris, the Western Pittwater Community Association (WPCA), submitted that the Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park needs to be viewed as the precious centre of Sydney's green lungs. As such, its edges and any incursions into its interior become critical threats to its integrity. There are inherent issues in the current proposal including landslip, excessive visibility, unacceptable pressure on the environment, unresolved bushfire management, parking and precedent setting. There are also critical and strategic planning issues such as management of the edges of the national park, the long term strategic importance of the national park, impact on the long term viability of the national park. WPCA opposes the developer's proposal for subdivision and rezoning of Currawong and recommends that it be returned to public ownership as part of Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park.

Mr Livio Panozzo expressed his concern that the loss of Currawong to development would be a loss of another icon and another loss of our history, heritage and culture. Currawong is not as grand as the Sydney Opera House but much more representative of part of our history and what it is. Let's preserve it.

Ms Penny Rosier asked whether it is a reasonable process to have two issues, the outcome of one dependent on the decision of the other, considered at the same time by the same people. The process to determine the future of Currawong appears to be flawed. She questioned whether the expert panel members are the right people to make an unbiased recommendation on the heritage value of Currawong and the long term real value of the site to Pittwater residents, to Sydneysiders, to Australia and beyond. She referred to the issues raised by other submissions such as parking, waste disposal, building on flood-prone land, water supply, bushfire, sand dune. Ms Rosier believes Currawong is a precious resource which should not be squandered simply in order to enable an individual or company make a lot of money.

Ms Margaret de Low has been a volunteer within the Pittwater area involving environmental concerns for 30 years. She suggested that refusal of development at Hamilton Estate in 1996 by the Land and Environment Court equally applies to Currawong. The removal of 136 native trees at Currawong is obscene. Currawong is naturally and culturally important and the proposed development would destroy its character. The Union history of the area speaks for itself and has become part of our history and heritage and fulfils a great social need of affordable cottage accommodation for those further afield and possibly less fortunate. Currawong must be saved and heritage listed. Keep it in public hands for all to enjoy.

Mr Storm Jacklin, President, Palm Beach & Whale Beach Association Inc, the oldest community group on the northern peninsular with over 500 members, strongly objects to the proposal on the grounds that planning powers have been taken away from Pittwater Council for a development that purports to be a State significant major project, which it is not. In particular, the Association objects to the lack of coordination and input from government departments that control the infrastructures (roads, parking, ferry service, mooring) that will service the development and the resultant impact on the existing community. They are also concerned that the traffic impact assessment contained wrong data and used wrong assumptions for assessment thus the conclusions are questionable. The Association submitted that this development should be rejected.

Graham Quint, Conservation Director, National Trust of Australia (NSW), opposes the proposed development at Currawong and supports the listing of the site on the SHR and the National Heritage List. The site is already listed on the National Trust Register. The area surrounding Currawong has already been placed on the National Heritage List. The Trust believes the site is of National significance for both its natural and cultural heritage values. Historically it is one of the earliest land grants on the western foreshores of Pittwater. Socially it is significant due to its long association with the NSW Labour Council. Architecturally it is significant through the intactness of the cabins and Midholme. The natural and cultural significance are their aesthetic and scientific values for research. Its rarity value is being one of the few intact post WWII holiday camps still in existence.

The proposed development would greatly complicate the interpretation of its history to future generations. The unnecessary loss of significant fabric, curtilage or character can never be rectified by an Interpretive Program. The Trust is also concerned the increased human activity in the area would have an impact on the surrounding national park. The proposed houses will intrude on the visual curtilage of the existing site. The socioeconomic changes in the area would result in unsympathetic or unnecessary upgrade, alterations and additions to the cabins compromising the significance of fabric. The significance of cultural landscape has been overlooked or downgraded. The Trust believes the site should be listed in the National Heritage List with the subsequent protection under the EPBC Act and supports its listing on the State Heritage Register.

Ms Anne Bickford commended the Heritage Office's detailed and comprehensive nomination of Currawong for listing. Following her research, she provided a few comments on the draft nomination including listing of Coaster's Retreat and further history of the site. She also believes the listing curtilage should encompass the whole site of Unions NSW.

ATTACHMENT 2

List of Parties that appeared at Panel Hearings

List of Parties that appeared at the Hearings on 4th, 5th & 13th June 2008

1.	Eco Villages Pty Ltd Mr Allen Linz, Eco Villages Australia Pty Ltd Mr Michael Harrison, Architectus Mr Jonathan Bryant, Graham Brookes & Associates Mr Bruce Masson, Masson Wilson Twiney Mr Gary Mostyn, Pells Sullivan Meynick Mr Mark Tooker, Worley Parsons Dr Daniel Martens, Martens Consulting Dr Bob Paterson, Lanfax Laboratories Dr Anne Clements, Anne Clements & Associates Dr Alison Hunt, AHA Ecology Mr John Travers, Travers Environmental
2.	Mr Angelo Quaglia
3.	Mr Norman Carter
4.	Careel Bay, Pittwater Protection Association Inc Ms Kristine Martin
5.	Surfrider Foundation Mr Tom Kirsop
6.	Pittwater Council Mr Lindsay Dyce, Pittwater Council Dr L de Ambrosis, GHD Mr G Kotze, GHD Mr A Leventhal, GHD Ms Louise Collier, Cardno Lawson Treloar Ms Janine Formica, Pittwater Council Mr Robert A Moore, Robert A Moore Pty Ltd Mr James Payne, Pittwater Council
7.	Ms Cathy Kubany
8.	Pittwater Natural Heritage Association Ms Polly Thompson
9.	Ms Patricia Gleen
10.	Avalon Preservation Association Mr Peter Maymans
11.	Ms Jill Bruce
12.	Ms Patricia Giles OAM
13.	Ms Sue Martin
14.	Mrs Susan Colvin
15.	Dr Ken Hughes
16.	Brookvale Valley Community Group Dr Christina Kirsch Davies
17.	Palm Beach & Whale Beach Association Mr Storm Jacklin
18.	National Parks Association (Sydney Br) Ms Heather Roy
19.	The Honourable Dr James Macken, AM
20.	Association for Berowra Creek Dr Gabe Lomas
21.	Royal Australian Institute of Architects Mr Murray Brown

	Mr Peter Stutchbury
22.	Mrs Mary Newlinds
23.	Dr Stuart Spring
24.	Mr Giles Tabuteau
25.	Dr Richard Pearse
26.	Ms Kit Moore
27.	Church Point Reserve Association Mr Ray White
28.	Clareville & Bilgola Plateau Residents Association Mr John Waring Ms Jennie Mackenzie
29.	Friends of Currawong Mr Shane Withington
30.	Friends of Currawong Ms Jo Holder
31.	Ms Ann McMahon
32.	Pittwater Residents Against Inappropriate Development, Mr Harvey Rose
33.	Mr Bryan Penny
34.	Mr Richard Lepastrier
35.	Mr David Catchlove
36.	Mr Brian Kench
37.	Mr Craig Burton
38.	Mr David Boulton
39.	Ms Margaret de Low
40.	Ms Gabrielle Grimbacher
41.	Mr Robert T Dunn
42.	Mr Henry Wardlaw
43.	Mr David Gleen
44.	Ms Anne Hinds
45.	Mr Angus Gordon
46.	Mr Julian Pulvermacher
47.	Mr Stephen Crosby
48.	Ms Herminie Swainston
49.	Ms Wendy Starkie
50.	Mr Tony Cullen
51.	Miss Juliet Rayner
52.	Mrs Jenny Cullen
53.	Mr Aero Lepastrier Mr Mallee Lambert Ms Ishbel Cullen
54.	Ms Annabelle Kristevic
55.	Ms Ann Sharp
56.	Ms Susan Young
57.	Ms Toni Warburton
58.	Ms Susan Rushforth
59.	Ms Louise Mitchell
60.	Mr Simon de Burgh
61.	Ms Penny Gleen
62.	Mr Peter Altona
63.	Scotland Island Residents Association,

	Mr Bill Gye Ms Shar Jones
64.	Mr Stephen Burns
65.	Mr Robert Stokes, MP
66.	Ms Karen Lambert
67.	Ms Joanne Ritchie
68.	Dr Conny Harris
69.	Ms Jila Baker

70.	Mr John Brogan
71.	National Trust of Australia (NSW) Mr Graeme Quint
72.	Ms Susie Gold Mrs Elizabeth Anderson
73.	Ms Penny Rosier
74.	West Pittwater Community Association Ms Margie Morris
75.	Mr Alan Yuille
76.	Mr David Haythornthwaite