

**APPROVED Dangar Island League Public Meeting – Saturday 14<sup>th</sup> May 2011**

**10am – Community Hall**

Those members in attendance:

Elizabeth Trevena, Susan Adams, Nicola Weedin, Margaret Tillson, Dean Finnigan, Lisa Hayes, Michael Dean, Bronek Kracz, Ron Barrelle, Jan Barrelle, Susan Judd, Jenny Rowe, Yvonne Liechti, Terry Dorrough, Heather Dorrough, Tony Partridge, Sue Merrick, Christine Sanderson, Mark Cole, Vicki Worthington, Michael Liebenberg, Ana Pollock, Judy Nikola, Sara Galvin, Cybele Shorter, Carolyn Meadows, Peter Meadows, Aaron Todd, Wally & Margaret Bower, Sandra Spargo, Jane Wilson, Helen Kaminski, Chris Innis, Hans Pols, (Treasurer)

Anthony Schinckel (President), Judith Doyle (Sec)

Non-Financial members: Wynn Webber, Kym Thornton, Henry Innis.

-----  
1. Antony S thanked and welcomed all those present.

2. Apologies received from Pauline Foote, The Putts, Jo Karcz & Andy Payne

**3. Presidents Report** – Ant S advised that most reporting items were listed on the agenda and would be covered accordingly.

He asked the audience if anyone could provide an update on the **Community Hall proposal** – unfortunately there was no Hall committee member in attendance for feed-back. (The League contributed \$150 to the total \$500 cost of the submission preparation – that being the shortfall after community contributions of \$350)

Ant advised of two other items to be added to agenda: 1) Trees and 2) Island Art Projects – both proposed by Ana P

**4. Treasure's Report** - Hans P confirmed that the cheque account was at \$1.9k and the deposit account was approximately \$12k.

Hans confirmed there had been no large-scale commitments – Mullet Mail remains the only current major cost.

**5.1. Recycling** – Thanks again go to Judy N who organised the **e-waste** and to Tony P, Tony T, Cybele, Cath Philips and Jeff Gausala – all of whom gave time and services on voluntary basis.

It was considered a great success and the Committee have decided to repeat the collection on an annual basis.

**5.2. Wharf Shelf** – General agreement that the shelf is a great re-purposing centre. Tony P has been clearing once a week, and now taking some clothing items to the charity bins on mainland.

Meeting agreed that it might be better to clear on Sunday evening, so unwanted items can be included in Monday garbage collection.

General frustration with large, TV/e-waste/ items still being left in the shed. Suggestion that a notice be put up to say that e-waste items should take by individual to Sefton Rd (include details of where and opening time), and that such items should NOT be left at the wharf and individuals responsible to dispose of them directly to Sefton Rd – Councils e-waste depository.

Sue M – offered a corkboard to take up the suggestion of having a notice board to carry 'ads' for large items for sale (include TV's). **Tony P** agreed to action these points on behalf of everybody.

**6.1 Companion Pets** - Tony P reported that it was generally felt that since the mailbox brochure drop on dogs and cats earlier in the year, there have been some improvement in roaming dogs and subsequent faeces left around the island.

This appears to be an ongoing issue and pet owners must abide by the State and Council rules. The League will remind owners of their responsibilities on a regular basis.

HSC had provided pooch bags – these contain un-used dog poo bags, which attach to the dog's collar/lead to ensure they are always available. The bags together with HSC leaflets will be posted to dog owners. **(Judith D/JudyN)**.

**6.2.** Ana P asked how we might encourage **cat owners** to keep their pets inside at night and wear bells on their collars

Sue M advised the group that in the city owners were encouraged to provide runs that give controlled inside-outside access at nighttime.

1:6

It was thought that the HSC cat brochures could be distributed again, where it *strongly recommends that cats are kept inside at night and wear bells on their collars.*

There was comment on barking dogs – which appears to have been handled through neighbourly conversation, co-operation and assistance.

*Thanks go to the majority of pet owners who do indeed give good thoughtful supervision of their animals.*

## **7. Local Development: Mooney Mooney / Peat Island Land Sale**

Ant S reminded everybody: MM and Peat Is owned by the SPA (State Property Authority), and is up for sale/development proposals.

SPA has canvassed for community feedback at an open day in early April, and several Islanders attended. The SPA's next newsletter is due out end of month where feedback should be summarised.

There is general concern that this prime land could be sold off and permissions granted for inappropriate large-scale development in the Lower Hawkesbury.

The League feels that this is such an important local issue that a sub-group be formed. It is felt that the stakes for any over development granted on this site could, in turn, open up the whole river for further unsympathetic development.

The DI sub-group should also liaise with Mooney Mooney and Brooklyn groups. It's possible that the three groups could have different motivations / agendas surrounding such a development.

Yvonne L had been personally active with writing to various media to gain some awareness. Through discussion with MM group she discovered that indeed they had an interest in developing what has been come a 'dying' community at MM since the closing of the Hospital site. Yvonne commented that it is a State issue and bigger than local Councils whilst awareness / commentary must be made at all levels.

Ana P said that we are privileged to live in such a pristine river community just 1 hr from Sydney. It's our challenge to harness urban sprawl from entering the natural unique escarpments of the lower Hawkesbury.

Co-existence will continue to challenge both governments and residents with our preserving our natural environment.

Michael D said that he'd attended Brooklyn's last Community Meeting and had list of their concerns/interest.

Margaret T commented that a straight NO development may not be our best route - as concept of sustainable eco low manageable development philosophy could become the bench mark for the future.

Tony P and Sarah G – comments also concurred that low impact development could include Parks & Recreational facilities and indeed environmentally educational facility, which indeed could be appropriate for the given space.

There has been a good track record in the recent past of providing input to such development proposals and limiting their scale::

~ LJ Hooker land residential development alongside Parsley Bay was not approved – much of this work was lead by Harry Recher;

~Ana and others were involved in the process around Kangaroo Pt , hotel and other accommodations/facilities based on 'visual' impact.

Ana advised that the effort, time and planning to take such projects on should not be underestimated

It was agreed that Bronek Karcz would chair the League sub-committee with other committee members Chris Innis, Michael Dean and Andy Payne. League members from the Public Meeting to join were Yvonne L and Terry D.

Chris I stated that anybody who has history of river, knows of environmental lawyers, has political contacts or similar – could play and make a positive contribution.

Cybele S – offered her services as an environmental scientist.

First MM/Peat Is meeting will meet then at the Café 9.30 Saturday 21<sup>st</sup> – the Hall will also be booked should the numbers for interest swell!

**2:6**

## 8. Water Access – DI Wharf ‘co-op’

Ant S advised the meeting of the survey results:

IN SUMMARY TOTAL OF 53 HOUSEHOLDERS RESPONDED

Q 2): Are you : 50 FULL TIME / 2 PART-TIME / 1x 6 month

Q 3): Water front with Jetty 3 Water front with no Jetty 7 Water front tidal 7 Non-waterfront 36

Q 4): Interest in berthing: 35 Buy 5 Buy to Rent 3 Buy or Rent 1 Rent to use 1 Not affordable  
2 Not now 2 Not Eligible 2 No 2 ?

Q 4): Prepared to purchase shares: 42 Yes 2 Not Eligible 6 No 1 not marked

Q 5): *Comments:*

Ant summarized comments and maybe some misunderstanding on some questions on the survey:

~ Investment – did not mean profit making, rather the implication is buying to rent out at modest CPI rate of return versus buying for one’s own use. It does not mean investment in the sense of profit making

~ Restricted rent. Whilst hard to monitor – guidelines would be set as indicator. Making profits from rental was not intended.

~ The location. There were 7 possible locations but only 2 for practical and cost reasons could really be considered. These options would be explored in more detail with residents and stakeholders.

~ The physical shape/layout of the primary wharf option: “T” or “L” - straight-out considered as less invasive on neighbours.

~ Ownership model: Is it Home or Person – currently leaning towards Person as seem to be the fairer option.

Ant S reminded the group that HSC had presented a plan to Maritime that was independent of our Coop one. Maritime asked for their plan to be re-submitted and incorporate all community needs (i.e. the Coop etc). It was at this time that the sub-committee was talking to both parties – so a suggestion that we move on our plan now would be timely.

Ant also recapped for the group that whilst the ‘co-op’ would have to be funded privately, HSC are responsible for disabled access and Maritime for public berthing.

Ant mentioned that there appear to be no other government bodies that might take up any financial support – hence fees might seem high for some Islanders, but we have to raise the capital for such a scheme. However if anybody knows of such a ‘body’ would they please come forward.

~ There was discussion around the point system – whilst accepted not perfect it was aimed at commuter boat traffic and to solve the mooring problem for many islanders. It will probably be modified as the Co-op is created.

~ Questions raised: re hot berthing or named berths. Currently considered named berths would be easier to monitor correct usage.

Some said that they’d not seen the plan. The proposed outline plan had been available and distributed at previous Public Meetings – it was considered that at a next ‘open’ Public Meeting on this project that they might be displayed again, though it was emphasized that it had been discussed and possible layouts shown at several DIL Public Meetings. **(Ant S)**

**Both Ant S and Ron B, stressed that the sub-committee has established open dialog with the HSC and Maritime and gained, in principle, both parties support. HSC required further confirmation that indeed there was local support for such a facility and a clear indication that island investment was available.**

3:6

Ant S reported that the second survey results show there are serious interested parties plus the potential 'private' funding available for such a scheme. Both critical factors to further discussions, and commitment from HSC and Maritime

---

Discussion opened to the floor:

Ron B again confirmed the points above – i.e., to get to this point the process with significant community interaction as well as discussions with HSC and Maritime to date was necessary. As stated in last Public mins. – Continuing Community Open Forums would be in the next stage, followed by further dialogue/meetings with HSC, Maritime and later Department of Lands. He felt that if the scheme could be 'locked in' prior to Christmas that would be to an advantage.

Ron B commented that assuming things continue to progress he would consider September 2012 for the likely build to be a reasonable estimate.

Ant S confirmed that *seeds of investment* would next be required, and we would need to form 'a co-op' as a Legal entity registered with Office of Fair Trading. Once the group is set in this form it will separate from the League to become it's own unit with elected directors.

Terry D – Had made a four page submission to the sub-committee and took opportunity to share he thoughts in the meeting:

~ Had been president of league in 90's and along with Ron B had been involved in plans for 'similar scheme' then. But Land and Public works not on side.

~ Thanks to Ron B for the work on current proposals (and previous ones)

~ Appears over time gone from small public model to larger private style

~ Living on the North side meant that there would be more new boats all coming to one spot

~Extended pontoon would change views

~Increased amount of traffic – 37 boats – treble current amount /noise and intrusion.

~Outboard motors block digital t.v. signal

~Stakeholders – how affect ferry travelers

~ How affect viability of ferry

~At times of wet and windy weather ferry travelers, 'longer dash' to board ferry

~Difficulty for ferry with pontoon further out

~As owner of jetty on North side aware of wind, tides (of 4 knots) and westerly winds - think pontoon straight-out proposal wrong (unlike BMC – which is not in weather and not in one line).

~Concerned in big winds/tides boats may sink or pull arms on pontoon

~Floods brining debris down river needs consideration

Overall Terry D felt that an 'L' shape design would be much better arrangement

Helen K – confirmed that she would not be opposed to 'L' – which would be towards and 'in-front' of her home.

Terry continued: In his view any new structure would not prevent or clear boats being moored on the wharf nor reduce current running lines and most people that use these moorings do not have the \$'s to afford a berth at the proposed DI co-op. There are 212 blocks of land and 112 without jetties. Overall it appeared that it was now a private structure. (Terry felt that he spoke for 7or 8 houses/tenants who he'd spoken with who were absent from the meeting).

Ant S – thanks Terry for his considered thoughts, and responded:

- Water Access proposal was very much considered public community project.
- The committee had spent 15 months, and has been raised at every Public Meeting in that time plus two surveys have complete. There has been opportunity for views to be raised before now.

The sub-committee members had spoken with Andrew D (ferry) whom was happy with the outline proposals, and they will speak with all other interested stakeholders (Rick from the water taxi, the garbage services, Miss Piggy Barges etc)

- The actual shape of the structure could indeed still be looked, and Terry's input would greatly appreciated.

Mark C – thanked and respected Terry's comment. Adding that he'd had much experience of boating and that his 'gut' feel was that shape/design could be problematical and that different orientation might be more forgiving of the weather issues.

Ron B Again explained that the proposal/designs today had partly been to 'run it up the flagpole' to see if it would fly with council. And that the sub-committee would not be adverse into looking at the shape prior to next round of meetings.

Wynn: said that 20 yrs ago BMC was dedicated berthing – Ant S explained again that that was the current preferred option here too.

#### 4:6

Ant S : It was not sure if the DI 'co-op' would place even greater pressure on BMC slots. However it was decided at the time of the starting the DI project it was too much to try to solve the Brooklyn end at the same time.

Chris S – Asked that any lighting on the proposed wharf be environmental sensitive. We live in a dark place and like it. Ant S agreed and many nodded to this, though some minimal lighting would be needed for safety.

Wynn asked would it be a problem with other boats hitting the wharf if it is so far out in the Channel. It was explained that on the current straight out design it did not go as far as Andrew D (ferry) buoy's and was therefore not in the channel.

Margaret T commented that whilst accepting that the whole process is full of complex issues, there was some concern that long-term renters on the island – of which there are many – should not be ignored. Many not having the liquidity to own a home let alone a mooring berth and that there whole livelihoods, which they set up here are based on their landlord – should not be forgotten.

It's its not lack of desire more financial impediment to access purchased spot but to lease and rent options would be welcomed.

Q from Margaret T - What was the motivation for the proposal – 'to stop illegal moorings' ?

Response from Michael D and Ant S - no this certainly was not the main motivation. It may be a side benefit.

There maybe more rental berths come about in time. But as said earlier by some people who currently are berthing for free are not going to want to pay anyway.

Ron B explained that the system at Church Pt/Scotland Island has 'free' mooring. Provision had been made in current scheme for drop off/ temp mooring, and set-time public mooring. **We would look at the Scotland Island system for further consideration. (Ron B)**

Helen K also mentioned a hot-berthing system at Berowra Waters.

Chris I – suggested that Open Display/Forum/Discussion in the Hall, on the wharf proposals should be set up in the coming weeks, to take on all or any further comments for consideration.

Anna P and Terry D agreed to join the 'fringe' of sub committee in-order that further thoughts may be considered as the proposal takes on its next developmental stage.

Henry Innis joined the meeting and expressed an interest in assisting with the MM/Peat Is committee group .... AntS advised of next Saturday's meeting.

#### A.O.B

**9.) Trees** Ana Pollack addressed the meeting on 'where natural and urban pressures meet' – with specific interest surrounding the BlackButt trees on the Island.

Ana is keen to make proposal to HSC and would like the Leagues support.

#### **The DI Tree Heritage & Recovery Plan proposal in two parts.**

##### 1) Listing of Trees:

*"Dangar Island is situated at the prominent focal point surrounded by ancient sandstone escarpments on the Hawkesbury River. Its build environment is mostly covered by canopy of blackbutts and Rough barked apple. This forest community is of regional significance due to its rarity in Hornsby Shire.*

The retention of canopy is critical, scenically and it is ecologically important. Tree hollows provide an important habit for animals – such as the endangered Glossy Black cockatoo.

Ecological, historical and scenic tree values on the island need to be comprehensively assessed in view of continual depletion for urban development.

Proposal is therefore to indentify and map trees – with significant (both scientific & accepted). Compile a 'heritage' register of trees on DI to be incorporated into HSC existing Tree Heritage to guide future development in an informed way.

#### 5:6

2) Recovery planting plan:

Collection of seeds of provenance from the islands blackbutt trees. Planting and care of seedlings propagated by HSC – jointly with DIBRG

Ant S confirmed that the League would be happy to support such a programme. Ron B advised that the due process are in place - Sec 49 deals with such items.

This item should be on September Public/AGM Meeting Agenda.

**Judith D to note agenda item & also agreed to work with Ana P as liaison within League.**

Wally B reminded the group that by the sheer nature of the trees we have, they carry a lot of white ant and many houses get affected. There is a balance between maintaining heritage trees whilst not taking risks with unsafe trees with dead and dangerous limb. Blackbutts are known for dropping big limbs.

It was noted at this point that both on the Island and in Brooklyn several blackbutts had indeed dropped limbs, in the past few weeks, and caused considerable damage – thankfully no human injury occurred.

HSC had advised the League of selected pruning of the big blackbutt tree in Grantham. Lopping the canopy and branches of less than 600mm. This will take place in July. Neighbours and the League will be advised once date is organized.

Susan A asked what was happening with regards to the blackbutt by fire station in light of new fire shed construction. Bronek/Wally and Ant all confirmed that there was NO recommendation or need for the tree to be effected. Building plans are in process of being submitted.

#### **10. Art Projects - Ana P proposals**

**10.1 Recent Felled Black-Butt** - Ana P put forward proposal to transform recently felled giant blackbutt into a group of low tables for public use in the park.

She confirmed that the owner was consulted and had provided the timber.

**10.2 Mosaic Map** – Joint venture between resident artists' and island children to create a welcoming map in mosaic of DI to help guide visitors around the island.

It is proposed that the site would be on concrete slab between bench and main road on Riverview just up from the Café on the right-hand side – in front of first fixed bench.

Both projects gained support from all members and Ant S thanked Ana for the conception and time involved to 'make them happen'.

Meeting concluded at 12.20pm

**NEXT PUBLIC MEETING SATURDAY 3<sup>RD</sup> SEPTEMBER 2011**

**6:6**