



Destination Management Plan – Community Engagement Outcomes Summary

Potential impact of project: LGA Wide/low

Note this report summaries community feedback received in the second phase of engagement in the development of the Destination Management Plan (DMP) placed on public exhibition from **15 April - 29 May 2017**

Phase 1 engagement occurred between November 2016 and March 2017 and was designed to inform the development of the Draft DMP. Outcomes of Phase 1 engagement can be found in the Report considered by Council at its meeting of the 4 April 2017 at which it was resolved to place the Draft DMP on public exhibition.

Phase Exhibition of Draft DMP – Phase 2 Community Engagement

Engagement and communications techniques used

- Email to those involved in phase 1 engagement
- Media Release
- Newspaper
- Council Website
- Online Community Engagement portal which included:
 - Draft Plan
 - Council Report
 - Q&A function
 - Feedback form

Responses in numbers

1) Written Submissions - 27

- 12 submitted short comments via Council webpage
- 15 submitted comments via email

2) Online Engagement Portal

Online engagement platform statistics

- Total Visits to the website - 208
- Max Visitors Per Day - 24
- New Registrations - 19
- Engaged Visitors (those who made submissions or submitted comments) - 15
- Informed Visitors (those who accessed documents) - 73

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	Community Comments
1	This plan does not take into account the frequent use by horse riders and riding competitions. Large events, crowds and noise are not compatible with horse events. Surrounding areas of Belrose & Terrey Hills have the largest horse in the southern hemisphere and rely on the facilities.
2	Very disappointed not to see the mention of Northside Riding Club or equestrian activities in the plan. It would be a crying shame to lose a piece of the area's history - which is so well attended and provides so much to the community. Please keep NRC and the equestrian community involved.
3	It is important to include the growth of current equestrian activities in your plan. The facility is essential for horseriders in the Sydney Area as there are few facilities such as this available to the sport.
4	The St Ives Showground area has been home to Equine Sports and many other outdoor activities, including Motor bike riding for children, remote control planes, AFL, Football. This area should be for local sport not Tourism projects. In particular equine activities have been there for 50+ year .
5	I am a concerned member of Northside Riding and that they were not mentioned as a stakeholder in the report. Equestrian activity is an existing tourism generator/ participant. Please do not ignore the horse community and its participants.
6	I would like to see the continuation and allowance of Equestrian Activities at the Showground. I believe many families and the equestrian community highly value clubs such as Northside Riding Club and it is invaluable to the community
7	This plan doesn't show any consideration for the local community who currently use this facility actively - the horseriders specifically aren't mentioned but neither are the dogwalkers, motorcrossriders, motorised car people, etc. I feel this plan is lacking in many aspects - disappointing!
8	Please consider keeping Northside Riding Club at St Ives Showground in the development plans as this is a key community hub for equestrians, horse hobbyists, elite athletes, animal lovers and community connection which has been incredibly important in my life and the life of much of my community
9	I regularly attend events at the Princess Anne Equestrian Centre with other equestrian participants that are not local. I find it quite odd that the plan makes no mention of these events. Could you please consider including the equestrian element in the plan.
10	The show ground is a great spot for families, clubs and social activities close to nature. With all the development happening on the beaches. Don't change the show ground and take away the clubs. Many people respect and enjoy seeing the horses . C
11	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Destination Management Plan (DMP) for Ku-ring-gai Local Government Area (LGA). The comments below from Northside Riding Club (Northside) relate primarily to the parts of the DMP that relate to the "St Ives Precinct". Northside was not invited to participate in the initial stakeholder consultation; this submission includes suggestions to develop and expand reach into other segments of the visitor market.</p> <p>1. New opportunities and current use of the St Ives Showground Northside strongly supports the view that tourism initiatives should integrate with current community and recreational / sporting activities at the St Ives Showground to develop an integrated multi-purpose destination (p.15).</p> <p>Northside also supports the retention of the 'heritage story' (p. 16) of the Showground in any re-branding strategy; this heritage encompasses not only the buildings and equipment at the Showground but also the activities and past uses on this regional resource. The current Plan of Management, adopted by Council in 2015, acknowledges the St Ives Showground and Precincts as a much-valued regional recreation facility for Ku-ring-gai and the wider northern Sydney region. Much of that value comes from the natural bushland and rural setting and the wide range of recreation activities accessible at the Showground. These activities include horses and horse riding.</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

Equestrian activity has a long history at St Ives Showground and in the northeast region of Sydney and should be retained as a sub-brand centered around the Princess Anne Equestrian Arena.

2. Heritage value of horse riding activities and Northside Riding Club

Horses and horse riding have a long and rich history in this northeast region of Sydney.

Horses have been used in this area of Sydney since 1805 when George Caley used a pack horse to carry his equipment and collection of specimens on the first inland exploratory trip of the area. Caley and his pack horse set out from Pennant Hills, through the head waters of Cowan Creek and Terrey Hills, reached Narrabeen Lagoon, and returned via the Oxford Falls / Belrose area, the upper reaches of Middle Harbour and the Lane Cove River. The first show of the St Ives A. & G. Association was held at Hassell Park in 1921. Avondale Pony Club, now at St Ives, was the first pony club in the area starting life in 1953 at Turramurra.

Many famous horse people have been based in the area, or had their formative equestrian beginnings here. These equestrians include country and western singer Smokey Dawson, Boyd Martin, international trainer and competitor; Shane Rose, triple Olympian and medalist in Beijing, 2008, and Rio, 2016; Steve Jefferys, internationally renowned horse trainer who captivated the world as the Lone Rider galloping into the arena on Australian stock horse "Ammo" at the opening of the Sydney Olympic Games 2000; Tim Boland, successful eventer represented Australia internationally; and Edwina Tops Alexander, also a multiple Olympian.

Kur-ing-gai Council recognises that St Ives Showground is one of the most diverse equestrian venues in Sydney and has provided the home grounds of Northside Riding Club since 1979 when the Princess Royal and Captain Mark Phillips opened the Princess Anne Equestrian Arena. Northside Riding Club is one of the oldest equestrian clubs in metropolitan Sydney, established in 1973. As a community sporting club run by volunteers, Northside is the last multi-disciplinary riding club in this area of Sydney and offers a variety of equestrian activities for all ages and all levels of rider from beginners to Olympians. Club activities include competitions, clinics, training days in a range of equestrian disciplines and information evenings.

Northside was one of first adult riding clubs to welcome para-equestrians to participate in regular dressage competitions and is currently working with Kur-ing-gai Council to build accessible toilets at Princess Anne Equestrian Arena. Northside was awarded a 2006 Commonwealth Sport Achievement Award, for *Outstanding Contribution by a Sporting Club* and was the 2007 Equestrian Australia Club of the Year. Northside continues to be an important community and regional sporting association contributing to the social cohesion of the area. As an example, over the past 12 months, more Ku-ring-gai residents who have moved into recently built apartments in the area are attending Northside events as non-equestrian spectators, enjoying both the events and the natural bushland setting with their families.

3. Special Events

Northside has hosted major equestrian events at Princess Anne Equestrian Arena. These include one of the major Grand Prix Show Jumping Competitions in NSW, the Copabella Classic. Australia's best riders compete at this event, travelling from interstate to attend. Professional riders use Northside as a venue to prepare their horses for elite competition. Equestrian events attended by elite competitors raise the profile of St Ives Showground and Northside Riding Club as a prestigious equestrian venue.

There are opportunities to develop a regular series of high profile equestrian events at the Showground. Northside's success as an equestrian club provides a readily available local, regional and state audience for major equestrian events, tapping into an existing visitor market.

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>4. Tourism opportunities. The Showground and adjacent national parks provide facilities/amenities for equestrian activities beyond the events and clinics offered by Northside. Horse trekking holidays are popular with riders and non-riders alike. For example Globe Trotting (http://www.globetrotting.com.au/) offers rides suitable for beginners to experienced riders. Trekking holidays generally operate in more remote areas. However with the opening up of trails in National Parks, there are opportunities to explore shorter trekking experiences in the Kur-ing-gai and Northern Beaches areas.</p> <p>5. In summary, Horses and horse riding have a long and valued history in this region of Sydney. Equestrian activity has created a significant Sydney North East Equine Industry Cluster, a valuable economic asset that attracts inward revenue and sustains local investment and employment with further growth potential. It has shared infrastructure, interdependent businesses and a skilled specialised and shared labour pool and an established market. Princess Anne Equestrian Arena at the Showground, and the associated trails are valuable recreational infrastructure and valued community assets. For nearly 40 years Northside has been showcasing equestrian activities, and sharing the Princess Anne Equestrian Arena with other compatible users. The Committee, members and friends of Northside Riding Club are proud to be part of the management and development of such a fabulous regional resource, and are committed to remaining an integral part of its future.</p>
12	<p>There doesn't seem to be anything about horse riding. This semi rural area are been for a very long time a place where kids could take responsibility of a pony and go ride. The encroachment of 'developers' is already reducing the area for riding..very special in such a major city please keep it!</p>
13	<p>I would be very unhappy to see the St.Ives Showground and surrounding areas be used totally for this type of development; the equestrian and dog activites at the Showground and surrounds are important to preserve and would be detrimental to eliminate them from this area</p>
14	<p>We wish to register our objections to the encouragement of tourism in Ku-ring-gai to the extent that it impacts on the use of scarce community land for private purposes. We refer to the remnants of Duffys Forest and specifically to the St. Ives Showground facilities. We do not consider the Plan's proposed use of parts of this community land to be in the best interests of local residents. We believe the concept to be inconsistent with what the St. Ives Showground was originally established for back in the 1920's. That is, an agricultural and horticultural display facility, later to include horse shows, an equestrian arena, a dog training area, an area for a model aircraft flying club, The Mens' Shed, etc. all of which are viewed as valued assets for the local community. The construction of a five star hotel on this site, principally to foster tourism in Ku-ring-gai, shows little imagination compared with several other options that could be made available for this unique and priceless site.</p>
15	<p>Make Ku-ring-gai . . . Sydney's New Eco-Tourist Destination I wish to respond to Ku-ring-gai Council's Draft Destination Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council should promote Ku-ring-gai's superb natural and built heritage that exists today near its railway stations. Sustainable tourism must be linked to Ku-ring-gai's excellent pubic railway transport service. I comment the outstanding heritage values of Turramurra's Little Village Park, the Hillview Heritage Precinct, Sheldon Forest and its remnant Blue Gum High Forest. These outstanding heritage places need to be promoted, restored, connected and importantly celebrated. Ku-ring-gai has the opportunity of creating some of Sydney's most ecologically significant walking trails. Ku-ring-gai Council's Destination Management Plan must ensure that Ku-ring-gai's outstanding heritage values are restored and protected as one of Sydney's most significant eco-tourist destinations. I commend Ku-ring-gai Council's tourism plan to protect, restore, promote and celebrate Ku-ring-gai's outstanding environmental values.</p>
16	<p>'Make Ku-ring-gai . . . Sydney's New Eco-Tourist Destination and save our natural environment for the future.</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>I wish to respond to Ku-ring-gai Council's Draft Destination Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council should promote Ku-ring-gai's superb natural and built heritage that exists today near its railway stations. Sustainable tourism must be linked to Ku-ring-gai's excellent public railway transport service.</p> <p>I comment the outstanding heritage values of Turramurra's Little Village Park, the Hillview Heritage Precinct, Sheldon Forest and its remnant Blue Gum High Forest. These outstanding heritage places need to be promoted, restored, connected and importantly celebrated. Ku-ring-gai has the opportunity of creating some of Sydney's most ecologically significant walking trails.</p> <p>Ku-ring-gai Council's Destination Management Plan must ensure that Ku-ring-gai's outstanding heritage values are restored and protected as one of Sydney's most significant eco-tourist destinations.</p> <p>I commend Ku-ring-gai Council's tourism plan to protect, restore, promote and celebrate Ku-ring-gai's outstanding environmental values.</p> <p>Another point I would like to raise is that as it is, the wonderful Blue Gum High Forest can be decimated by "planners" who have no thought of the future..we need to ensure the Blue Gum High Forest, Sheldon Forest bushland, Turramurra Heritage park etc are retained as they are at present..no buildings, no sports areas etc..just wonderful examples of what the past was like for early settlers and they are so easy to access by the general public. People need somewhere to get away from the hustle and bustle and relax. Once it is gone, it is gone forever.</p>
17	<p>Kuringai is unique and we all are proud to be residents of this beautiful area. It will be great to show the world Kuringai has been in the forefront of managing Eco tourism and giving the best to the residents to enjoy the natural surrounding and safe environment.</p>
18	<p>I wish to respond to Ku-ring-gai Council's Draft Destination Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council should promote Ku-ring-gai's superb natural and built heritage that exists today near its railway stations. Sustainable tourism must be linked to Ku-ring-gai's excellent public railway transport service.</p> <p>I comment the outstanding heritage values of Turramurra's Little Village Park, the Hillview Heritage Precinct, Sheldon Forest and its remnant Blue Gum High Forest. These outstanding heritage places need to be promoted, restored, connected and importantly celebrated. Ku-ring-gai has the opportunity of creating some of Sydney's most ecologically significant walking trails.</p> <p>Ku-ring-gai Council's Destination Management Plan must ensure that Ku-ring-gai's outstanding heritage values are restored and protected as one of Sydney's most significant eco-tourist destinations.</p> <p>I commend Ku-ring-gai Council's tourism plan to protect, restore, promote and celebrate Ku-ring-gai's outstanding environmental values.</p> <p>Nature is one of our most precious gift to others. Let's keep those special places!</p>
19	<p>Re: Draft Destination Management plan</p> <p>Thank you for the extra but short time, allowed for this submission. The DMP is a beautifully crafted document and if it wasn't for this prognosis, I would not have made a submission. http://earth-folk.blogspot.com.au/2009/04/earth-to-people-prognosis-not-good.html</p> <p>Introduction. While the spirit and style of Ku-ring-gai's Destination Management Plan is to be congratulated and commended, the DMP appears to have picked up themes that promote heavy development and harmful Big Event emphasis in St Ives, at the expense of gentler, conservation-oriented themes of "<i>found nowhere else, but on the brink of being lost</i>" (see submission).</p> <p>The situation is the result of no consultation with that section of the community in favour of conservation and repair of important built and natural heritage inheritance, greater remnant forest protection and use of retention, repair and regeneration.i Why are these 21st century issues not integrated into the DMP? Relegating their management to a later second stage would lose some unique destinations, to persisting in-isolation over-</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

development.

This submission highlights the vulnerability of decision-making in DMPs. Survival Economics for the 21st century is explained. In particular by built and natural inheritance found in Ku-ring-gai. *These distinguishing assets are unique to this LGA.* Yet, un-protected, they are in grave danger of being lost to the cumulative effects of re-zoning for development. In the context of Ku-ring-gai's ESA, economic objectives serve more immediate, declining and life-supporting environmental objectives of "*destination conservation*" eg. HHA, National Trust, Bush Heritage, etc. For 21st century reasons the DMP needs to change and tweak its "Vision" priority (Page 3). If not, like destination management plans across NSW, the end result could eventually demonstrate and indicate that ... Lands most desirable to protect ... have become lands most likely to be lost.

If not corrected at the start, the blow out at the end will show economic and financial viability at the expense of ecological sustainability. Loss of ecological sustainability is already clearly visible in all suburbs of Ku-ring-gai.

Destination Management Plans are now rolling-out across NSW. They reflect the mistaken logic of the 2014-2016 NSW Government's legislative "reforms". WHY?

The Economic motivation of those legislative reviews and regulatory reforms was clearly to allow "human use" (development and recreation) of Crown and Public Lands. Yet these lands are more desirable to protect for our common future, and the survival of Nature. Governments fail to see that: at all scales Nature needs places to be left completely un-disturbed to restore itself for its own intrinsic value. Or humans will not survive into the 21st century.

The DMP is a strategic document which will eventually combine with (add to) the thrust of multiple outdated development policies, that have been dominating the strategy of the Planning Department since the early part of the 21st century. In Ku-ring-gai these policies are completely unsuited to the "protection demands" of an Environmentally Sensitive Area in the 21st century.

Run-away development and recreation in Ku-ring-gai. Misalignment with the future is feared ... Cumulative development means one impact leads to another in this un-recognized environmentally sensitive area (ESA). The "invisible hand" of the planning department has successfully left Ku-ring-gai un-protected from cumulative environmental impacts of development and recreation. These are visibly incrementing at Nature's expense. It is feared such unforeseen strategy may also reveal itself in the Destination Management Plan's economic thrust.

The question arises: *Is the current Destination Plan an environment strategy for a future city?*

The DMP document exemplifies reasons why changes occurred in the Crown Lands Management Act in 2016. The original intent of governors in early Australia - was that the Crown Lands Act would preserve the fauna and flora of the continent. Those conservation intents were consciously changed by more than one Act of Parliament, allowing the state government's desired economic growth to be achieved, without consideration of cumulative impact and restraint.

Current development outcomes for Ku-ring-gai fulfil an out dated declaration that Ku-ring-gai is part of the Greyfield Belt of Sydney (Planning Congress Hobart 2011). The fact that the Planning Department did not apply system-available "red-flags" or critical habitat declaration to Rare

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

Urban Greenfield, demonstrates ecological perspectives are removed from the Planning perspective. As shown these standpoints continue to underpin decision-making in today's era of ecological decline.

Economic growth is achieved by both development and recreation. This happens with little or no regard to the security and protection of the continent's original fauna and flora, as there is no assessment of cumulative environmental impact. Forced amalgamation of councils blurs boundary and local diversity, to allow the blandness of Greyfield development in the most sensitive areas.

The question arises: Why was Ku-ring-gai described as Greyfield and what are the connotations and implications of that regressive, apparently un-informed opinion of an area of rare, urban biodiversity - which is not found in any other global city? Ku-ring-gai's assets need valuing *Greenfield*, not Greyfield.

The DMP Vision Statement needs to recognize that the misnomer *Greyfield* in relation to Ku-ring-gai has portrayed a unique Local Government Area as being in need of "*development*". That strategy enabled multiple re-zonings for development, *without protection by red-flagging, critical habitat declaration and E5 zoning*. Protection has been actively opposed, allowing over-development & uber-recreation.

Has an economic brief dictated vision again? Has a mythical recreation need positioned "viable" tourism ahead of culture and heritage? "*To position Ku-ring-gai as a distinctive, viable and highly accessible tourism destination through the sustainable development of innovative events and distinctive experiences related to our abundant natural environment, rich Aboriginal and European culture and heritage, and quality recreation facilities for the benefit of our residents and visitors.*" Reverting to more *ecologically* sustainable development means culture (aboriginal and early settler) and natural heritage need to be considered before financial viability. This if we care about Australia's remnant ecological assets.

In failing to recognize Turramurra's Heritage in the DMP, it is shown that baseline studies are overlooked, misunderstood and misinterpreted.

The Draft Residential Strategy 2000 highlighted and identified Ku-ring-gai's most distinguishing assets and features, many scientifically listed in state and national legislation. It stated:

"Ku-ring-gai exhibits environmental splendour of such a scale it is of national significance."

"Unique features of Ku-ring-gai include:

- *Most of the last remnants in the Sydney "bioregion" of the toweringly tall Blue Gum forests (the "bioregion" extends from Nelson Bay to Bateman's Bay and from the coast to the mountains).*
- *The largest number of threatened species (plants and animals) in the bioregion for a local government area. It is noteworthy that Ku-ring-gai has similar numbers of bird and plant species as the entire British Isles.*
- *4 National Parks in and around Ku-ring-gai:*
 - *Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park*
 - *Lane Cove National Park*
 - *Garigal National Park*
 - *Dalrymple Hay Forest National Park (Nature Reserve)*". Travis McEwen Group

But who is listening to the voice of the other side? Since 2014 'legislation and regulation' underpinning protection of ecological assets has

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

regressed. This can be seen from the absence of assessment of cumulative environmental impact – both in regional resource mining and in the more locally visible “urban mining” of rare soils and seedbank in Ku-ring-gai. See the cumulative impact of mining in this map. Environmental impacts become more and more irreversible, as cumulative effects are ignored. In a global environment of biodiversity collapse these assets need urgent protection from cumulative environmental impact. Yet strategic planning departments find this concept incredible! Why?

Survival Economics and the DMP

Council will have no future control over the cumulative impacts of the DMP.

Councillors, consultants, officers and land “managers” should remember there is no ceiling or limit to the Destination Management Plan (as once occurred with LEPs).

This is a *strategic plan*. Unless *environmental and heritage considerations* are pre-defined, pre-prioritized and pre-protected, they will take secondary place.

Future assessment for a large tourist development will not be carried out by Council, but by District or State Planning Panels. The adopted Ku-ring-gai Destination Management Plan will be used as their guide.

Councillors today have no way of stopping the development juggernaut. Entire streets are being bulldozed. As has happened with residential development across Ku-ring-gai, Greyfield planning will dominate the DMP and Sydney will lose the unique cultural and natural heritage that was once in Ku-ring-gai.

Why does the DMP talk about “sustainable development”? Where are the words and objectives of *ecologically* sustainable development (ESD)?

It wasn't by accident that the NSW government began dropping the word “ecologically”. It was a calculated move to encourage financial sustainability over ecological sustainability. This is not 21st century thinking.

To the ecologically aware person, as humanity approaches crucial tipping points, this is a fatal error in the 21st century. Re-thinking the financial viability of 20th century and the philosophy of “hard-hoofed”, un-sustainable economics, replacing it with ecologically sustainable development (ESD) should be a given in the 21st century!

But not for short-term visions of current economics.

Across NSW and Australia. Ecologically sensitive area are being targeted with Destination Management Plans, development and mining projects which override protective objectives. (See the World Heritage Blue Mountains DMP).

E zones are weakened. Stronger E 5 zones are ridiculed. Heritage Nominations are stopped by interference and obfuscation. The objective is to exploit the heritage and natural wealth of the state and country to achieve short-term economic goals.

In Ku-ring-gai the state government & the Planning Department gave Ku-ring-gai neither protection nor recognition as an ESA before re-zoning for development.

Should a DMP allow more development in the 21st century in an environmentally sensitive area - under guise of what will most certainly become uber-recreation?

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

Survival Economics should replace short-term Management Economics. 5

Not recognized in Destination Management Plan – Why?

Survival Economics and “wow-factors” of the future. Relevant to human survival, many opportunities exist in Ku-ring-gai. If these opportunities are ignored, it shows lack of understanding about human survival into the future. Will they make Ku-ring-gai a Destination for the 21st century? Is Ku-ring-gai on the clever planet?

21st century survival economics principles.

- Recognize distinctions between Land ‘Management’ and Asset Conservation
- Move up to intellectual level needed for 21st century problems and rise above old economics, shallow competition and damaging ‘entertainment’.
- Work with schools and institutions to create new industries and employment aligning with the “Age of Anthropocene”
- Consult with scientists to find climate friendly and biodiversity conservation jobs and employment.

No more 20th century thinking in Sydney’s Ku-ring-gai

Note: Nature based & heritage assets are not “under utilised and under capitalised” !

1. The DMP says:

Ku-ring-gai has major nature based and heritage assets that are under utilised and under capitalised,

Agree with Festivals & Events but not cumulatively harmful-to-Environment events!

2. The DMP says:

Opportunities to include strategies to further, harness Council’s expertise in the delivery of innovative festivals and events

Agree with tourist target / visitation increase - but not Big Events and hard-hoofed animals for recreation more suited to Big event stadiums and Olympic Parks !

3. The DMP says:

Three key tourism themes have been identified for Ku-ring-gai:

- Nature-based tourism,
- Aboriginal heritage
- Major events principally hosted at the St Ives Showground and Wildflower Garden.

Why does the DMP not see the opportunities for survival economics? Note:

Clever Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate *setting*. This includes visual and sensory setting, as well as the retention of spiritual and other cultural relationships that contribute to the *cultural significance* of the *place*.

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

Not recognized in the Destination Management Plan – why?

The Hillview HCA – J.H Nomination for State Heritage Listing. Health Precinct for physical & mental health restoration was suggested.

Why the Hillview HCA was nominated for State Heritage Listing

- Vanishing ecological inheritance of Australia is identified as “heritage” by the J.H Nomination. More than just a place of local significance, Hillview HCA has historically played roles in Sydney’s development that are not known to most.
- Forest plays a large part in the nomination. Rare, urban biodiversity belongs to the future city. Cities will not survive without restored and remnant regrowth forest – needed for humans and wildlife.
- Looking across from the “big hill” of Turramurra, to the urban forest showpiece (Sheldon Forest), the Hillview HCA has ecologically important views. They remind the future city that Sydney was built by logging the now critically endangered ecological communities of Blue Gum High Forest (BGHF) and Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest (STIF).
- Today regrowth remnants are the last habitat for unique Australian wildlife. The Powerful Owl can still be heard at dawn and twilight. The diamond python can still be seen in backyards. The web of wildlife and its necessary food-chain is still found within minutes of Ku-ring-gai’s railway stations. But for how long? ii

Hillview HCA distinguishes a model LGA by its unique setting.

- The Hillview HCA and the Little Village Park in Turramurra should meld into cultural memory. Why? They are last reminders of the way aboriginal inhabitants lived *with the land and its wildlife* and their habitat.
- The Railway line was first laid from Sydney to Ku-ring-gai to bring the early Sydney population away from an already polluted Sydney. Clean, fresh air of last forests of the North of Sydney are again vulnerable in 2017 - but crucial to keep. iii
- Hillview HCA shows why the future city must value and protect endangered ecological communities. This is not easily understood. The picture has changed since a generation of environmentalists did their bit to protect Australia’s natural heritage. Today’s destruction of rare urban forest is hidden and insatiable. iv
- The “big hill” of Turramurra has lost most remnant Blue Gum High Forest (BGHF). Regrowth is no longer possible where apartments have stopped the capacity to regenerate because of soils and seedbank removal. This makes Public reserves like Sheldon Forest all the more critical for the future city.

The J.H Nomination links to the 21st century and Survival Economics.

- Employing an ecological perspective the Nomination tried to lift the threshold of its local significance to State Heritage Listing to crucially consider the most important need of the 21st century – public understanding of a newer environmentally sustainable Survival Economics. v
- It is not surprising that the Criteria and Principles engaged by the J.Harwood Nomination of Hillview HCA for State Heritage listing were missed/misunderstood and rejected by the Heritage Division. That happened mainly because external forces were brought into play. Obfuscation by outdated planning systems influenced the decision-making process.
- To understand the rejection one must step back to the level of land-use planning. The land-use Planning degree urgently needs updating to 21st century relevance. vi If Sydney and Australia are to protect their vanishing identity, land-use planning and heritage assessment must capture & consider 21st century ecological perspectives.
- Survival Economics is needed in all decision-making to protect lifesupporting ecosystems. vii

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

Adaptively reused, the Hillview HCA site and setting has the ability to remind future generations of the way things were when old Sydney-town was first being built and before the Blue Gum High Forest vanished to less than 2%.

Traditional repair, adaptive restoration and re-use is suggested in keeping with the age & elegance of architecture and landscaping, urgent protection of the 100 year old row of camphor laurel trees and croquet lawn. In need of 21st century conservation.

Nomination form photos are taken by the writer. They capture the unique complex of buildings – in order to overcome the real and current threats of heritage nomination interference to allow the potential disfigurement of development.

Interference in, scuttling of the JH Nomination.

Why did it happen? Just some of the many questions arising....

1. Will Sydney's Hillview Heritage Conservation Area be protected?
2. The 100 year old row of camphor laurels are a heritage item in this rare context and location – why do they look so unwell?
3. What does the “Indicative Sketch” imply?
4. How will the Destination Management Plan prioritize protection of Ku-ring-gai's remaining environment and natural heritage for the future city?
5. Should the showcasing of 21st century conservation (repair, restore, regenerate and re-use) be the primary language of this distinctive area's Destination Management Plan?
6. Does “destination management” permit built and natural asset conservation?

Questions arising from current situation:

1. In view of heavy loss of urban bushland (endangered Duffy's Forest) to State Significant infrastructure like Frenches Forest Hospital and major road widening, can the future city of Sydney sustain more endangered bushland loss?
2. Will the financial viability of Big Events, like the Medieval Faire... which really belongs in the **Sydney Olympic Park**, be ecologically viable for the St Ives precinct which has vanishing endangered Duffy's Forest in the area?
3. Are jousting and horse riding and four wheel drives really appropriate for the long-term ecological sustainability of the soils and seed-bank adapted to the local St Ives area over millennia?
4. Why do big recreational impacts of St Ives Events dominate the DMP?
5. Why has Turramurra's Heritage as a destination area or protection been delayed/overlooked/misunderstood/ignored?
6. Why is the complex of historically layered buildings and the unique site of Hillview HCA on which that complex is located not comprehensively recognized by state & local government as a HCA worthy of State Heritage listing and restoration, repair and adaptive re-use as a Health Precinct?
7. What will it take to protect the Little Village Park from greed and over-development, insensitivity and outdated planning?
8. Why is cumulative /incrementing environmental loss of local Blue Gum High Forest in Turramurra eg. The Deferred Matter site, and concreting of local ESA, etc. not enough to save the Little Village Park from reclassification and the Sheldon Forest showpiece BGHF from RE1 zoning and possible loss?

This submission has much more to contribute.

However, as in the past, it appears suggestions for a 21st century direction

Sydney's Greenspaces lost to outdated over-development. Connections between the Little Village Park and Hillview HCA are raising

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>interest.</p> <p>Reasons for the Little Village Park being sacrificed to development indicate much is not known to the public. Yet this is rare Public Land of value is not an “under-utilized” development site. Likely loss increments the current loss of two large parcels of Public Land on the same precinct. Hidden behind confidentiality clauses, one fact is certain. Heritage inheritance concerns and connections between the Hillview HCA and the Little Village Park are more and more being examined by students interested in the loss of Sydney’s greenspaces and commons.viii</p>
20	<p>I understand that State Government wants you to promote tourism in our council area for the whole of Kuringgai, but I hope you are not putting all the plans in St Ives.</p> <p>Yes, St Ives has much to support a tourism {of sorts}, especially show casing the many beautiful natural walks in the area and the show ground, which is already appreciated and used for many activities not available in other areas of Sydney esp. in its natural setting. Also the aboriginal story of the area is part of our history and the link with the heritage and history with WW2.</p> <p>The disadvantage to St Ives is the lack of public transport to utilise the facilities here except by car. So the impact of traffic flow must be a consideration.</p> <p>If you were thinking of accommodation there is already a small scale resort and caravan park in the area though it is in Terry Hills.</p> <p>As this is an area for out-door activities, the accommodation should be as environmentally sensitive as possible and could be an ideal area for an eco friendly family style resort.</p> <p>Hopefully, the future plans will not degrade or demolish further the beautiful green spaces so vital to balance the high density in the rest of Sydney</p> <p>We are blessed to live in Kuringgai, so please be mindful that there are other suburbs in Kuring-gai also worthy of consideration in any future plans.</p> <p>Keep up the good fight to protect Ku-ring-gai from forced amalgamation. Congratulations on staying true to the majority of rate payers.</p>
21	<p>Ku-ring-gai Destination Management Plan</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Destination Management Plan for Ku-ring-gai Council (KDMP).</p> <p>STEP Inc is a local community based environmental group, with a membership of over 400 in the Hornsby/Ku-ring-gai area. Our group has considerable experience in analysing environmental issues and regenerating and preserving natural bushland.</p> <p>Consultation Process</p> <p>STEP Inc has in the past made detailed submissions to the Council on the draft Plan of Management for the St Ives Precinct. We note that consultation with a number of parties was held prior to the development of the KDMP early in 2017. Given the focus of the report on the St Ives Precinct we are disappointed that STEP was not invited to join in this consultation in view of the contributions we have made in the past. There are several important considerations have been omitted in the report. A copy of our submission on the current Plan of Management dated 27 February 2015 is attached.</p> <p>Ku-ring-gai Community Vision</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

The KDMP should be reviewed in the context of the Council's Community Strategy Plan (CSP) that sets out the high level strategy for Council actions through to 2030. This states that "Ku-ring-gai will be a creative, healthy, and liveable place where people respect each other, conserve our magnificent environment and society for the children and grandchildren of the future." The KDMP needs to ensure that the tourism plans will not conflict with the protection of the environment into the long term future.

Missed Opportunities in the KDMP

The dominant focus on the use of the St Ives Precinct as the major tourist destination is a simplistic means of developing tourism in the municipality that ignores many other opportunities. Ku-ring-gai is blessed to have unique bushland environment close to the town centres plus many areas with high quality historic built heritage. As the CSP states Ku-ring-gai has "a nationally significant ecological heart." What other major world city and local government area has such high levels of biodiversity within its boundaries? The Council could promote many other visitor experiences that would provide diverse opportunities for employment in other areas of the municipality and have the advantage of being more accessible than St Ives and would appeal to a broad range of people – see comment on Priority 3.1 below.

Suitability of St Ives Precinct as the major tourism site

The KLEP2013 currently does not permit accommodation development in the St Ives Precinct as the land is zoned as RE1 or E2. In addition, even if the zoning obstacle is overcome, STEP is opposed to major development in the St Ives Precinct. The development is to be built and operated by a commercial organisation. For it to be economically viable the operator will want to bring in large numbers of tourists all year round. There is even mention of the possibility of several types of accommodation such as an eco-resort, glamping and a hostel or dormitory. A developer is likely to want the location to be within E2 zoned land because of its visual attractions. This is totally at odds with the CSP to conserve the natural environment. Turning to the general focus of the report on the St Ives Precinct it does not provide evidence that the area described as the "St Ives Precinct" has been adequately assessed for its suitability for the proposed developments. Issues to be considered include the transport and parking requirements, the sewerage installation needs, the effects of bushfire controls on sensitive native vegetation and stormwater and nutrient overflow control needs from additional developed areas. If these factors are taken into account we question the viability of the proposals from the economic point of view let alone the environmental impacts. If the St Ives plans are not viable the DMP will be a failure. STEP supports the improvement in walking track connections and coordination with the NPWS. Links from the St Ives Precinct with Ku-ring-gai Chase and Garigal National Parks and upgrades to the current tracks are an ideal way to increase visitor numbers to Ku-ring-gai but there are also other areas within Ku-ring-gai that also could have greater recreational potential.

Detailed Comments on the KDMP Report Priorities

In the paragraphs below we comment on the KDMP by reference to some of the Priorities described in the report.

Priority 2

Continue to develop and re-position the St Ives Precinct as a contemporary and distinctive tourism destination in Sydney

2.1. Establish a Steering Committee comprised of experts with knowledge of tourism and urban planning opportunities for Ku-ring-gai to oversee the immediate planning and development of the Precinct.

Comment: Given the high natural environmental values of the area and the special requirements in maintaining them an expert with knowledge of natural area management needs to be included on the Steering Committee. Examples of these issues include the presence of the Duffys Forest Endangered Ecological Community and adjoining sclerophyll bushland.

Given the complexity of natural ecosystems and their current inclusion in the St Ives Precinct as defined in the KDMP this specialised area needs a dedicated management group that should have overall responsibility for ensuring land supporting endangered species or EECs and land zoned E1 and E2 is properly managed and not degraded by neglect or adjoining land use. One of the unique tourist appeals of Ku-ring-gai is the high quality

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

of most of its bushland. This can easily be lost since the dominant sclerophyll vegetation of the area is highly sensitive to water mediated impacts from adjoining land use and during fire recovery periods, that are essential for their survival, highly sensitive to disturbance by loss of seed banks and erosion.

2.2 Commission a revised Master Plan for the St Ives Precinct that determines the highest and best uses for the site for tourism, events, recreation and community activities.

Comment: The site as exhibited in Appendix 2 of the report includes extensive areas of E2 zoned land of high environmental value in strategically important locations.

“Highest and best use” is normally applied to land zoned for development. This definition of use is totally inappropriate for areas zoned for environmental conservation, with ecosystems that have evolved over millions of years and where priority is given to their protection from the adverse impacts of human development. For land zoned E1 or E2 no net impact from human use should be adopted. This is particularly important when dealing with the fire dependent vegetation communities on the Hawkesbury Sandstone and Mittagong Formation derived soils. Hawkesbury Sandstone soils on sloping site can be subject to high soil erosion when cleared (1).

(1) Chapman G A and Murphy C L 1989, Soil Landscapes of the Sydney 1:100,000 Sheet, Soil Conservation Service of NSW, Sydney. P67

2.4 Engage at a strategic level with NPWS, DNSW, Aboriginal tourism and heritage organisations and education providers (e.g. AHO, TAFE Northern Sydney Gamarada Aboriginal Education & Training Unit and Gawara Aboriginal Learning Centre – Northern Beaches) to identify industry and commercial partnership opportunities for nature based and Aboriginal tourism product and experience development and cultural interpretation at the Precinct.

Comment: There are clear conflicts of interest associated with, on the one hand commercially exploiting nature based and Aboriginal tourism, and conserving natural ecosystems for future generations. As mentioned above extensive areas zoned E2 have been included in the Precinct. Conservation of this land has to allow for the situation that most of the total area has indigenous native vegetation communities that are fire dependent and where at a given time and location many plant species are dormant as seeds within the top soil seedbank. These areas are vulnerable to stormwater run-off from development and continued human disturbance. A high level of human use also distorts the natural animal habitat value of the land. There needs to be a clear statement that any proposed activities and associated level of activity will have no net impact on the viability and extent of the native vegetation communities and habitat values.

2.5 Prepare a business case proposal after the Master Plan is finalised that articulates and promotes tourism infrastructure and investment opportunities associated with the St Ives Precinct to potential private sector tourism and hospitality investors and entrepreneurs.

Comment: Investors and entrepreneurs have in the past sought to focus on profits with token consideration for environmental impacts. There is little reason see why this would change, particularly in the new NSW strategic planning regime where development priorities will take precedence over most environmental issues. Indeed under the new NSW planning regime most of our existing environmental assets will be at a higher risk of degradation. For this reason the Master Plan should explain the environment constraints and sensitivity of the site including the E2 zones and Duffys Forest and other EECs that need to be clearly articulated and mapped.

2.7 Subject to anticipated determinations by Crown Lands Department, consider the establishment of a separate entity to manage the Precinct, or parts thereof, on Councils behalf (e.g. the Trust model is one that has been used by governments at all levels to encourage a specific purpose professional approach to land and asset management).

Comment: STEP objects to the establishment of a separate entity (eg the Trust model) to manage the Precinct on Council's behalf. Both in the United States and Australia Trusts proved inadequate for managing important natural resource assets such as National Parks and their management was transferred to a government body such as the National Parks and Wildlife Service that were skilled in dealing with requirements of

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

these special assets. The St Ives Precinct includes significant natural environment areas zoned E2 and endangered ecological communities such as Duffys Forest within an RE1 zone. Council has proven skills in managing these important environmental areas and has done so for decades. Changing to a Trust management arrangement would be a retrograde step.

Priority 3

Establish Ku-ring-gai as a key destination for year-round festivals and events in Sydney

3.1 Prepare an Events Strategy 2017 to 2020 that identifies events and strategies to deliver an annual program of festivals and events to increase visitation to Ku-ring-gai throughout the year.

Comment: It appears that the whole Ku-ring-gai area as a destination is competing with St Ives for festivals. It would be better if Ku-ring-gai was promoted as the main brand with events spread throughout the LGA to lessen the environmental impact associated with the higher intensity land use associated with these events. This will be important if natural grassed surfaces and the authentic natural character of the area is to be retained. Ku-ring-gai has one of the highest rainfalls in the region and wet grassy areas quickly get damaged if there is high foot traffic. The economic dependency and benefits should be shared throughout the LGA and not concentrated in one particular area.

The railway station precincts should be developed and promoted as the shared tourist gateway to Ku-ring-gai. This would improve the economies of the centres that have developed around them. The most outstanding heritage in Ku-ring-gai can be seen within walking distance of most of the railway stations. Also some outstanding day loop walks to Middle Harbour and Lane Cove River can be readily accessed from these stations, combining a heritage and bushwalk experience from the same starting location. The recent experience of the walks celebrating Blue Gum High Forest in St Ives and Turramurra that were organised by the Friends of Ku-ring-gai Environment demonstrates the level of interest in walks highlighting the unique bushland. These walks that were promoting with the limited resources of a local community group had 30 to 40 participants. Overnight accommodation within or adjoining the railway shopping centres and sympathetic to the character of the area should be considered, which would have the added benefit of increasing the tourist spend in these areas without increasing traffic congestion in the area. There are heritage houses and other buildings near the centres that could be converted to B&B type accommodation.

3.2 Develop and promote a comprehensive annual events and festivals calendar that promotes key festivals and events to attract new and repeat visitors to Ku-ring-gai.

Comment: Special buses from particular railway stations could be used to transport tourists to and from these events, including those held at St Ives. This would reduce the traffic and parking demand.

3.6 Encourage 'whole of destination' support for events and festivals through visitor friendly Initiatives (e.g. appropriate opening hours and availability of amenities and services).

Comment: This should include coordinated public transport support from selected railway stations for the larger events.

3.8 Engage an event evaluation consultant to regularly report and consistently evaluate visitation, visitor satisfaction and the economic impact of key tourism festivals and events.

Comment: If these events occurred in RE1 zones with or adjoining environmentally sensitive areas there would also be a need to evaluate any on-going environmental impacts and take appropriate rectifying action. This should be incorporated in item

3.8.

Priority 4

Further develop Ku-ring-gai's architectural heritage, cultural and recreational experiences and attract quality hospitality and retail operators to the area

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>4.1 Work cooperatively with Sydney Living Museums, local heritage stakeholder groups and operators to establish a strategic and coordinated approach to development of yearround heritage and cultural experiences in Ku-ring-gai. Comment: Most of Ku-ring-gai's railway stations retain their heritage character and could form a basis for many heritage and cultural experiences. These could readily be combined with high quality railway loop bushwalks (see comments 3.1)</p> <p>4.4 Create a 'Tourism and Hospitality Investment and Business Opportunities' website that is independent of Council's website but linked to the 'Doing Business in Ku-ring-gai' website section. Comment: This is of great concern as there is the real risk of separating business interests from the environmental sensitivity of this area. The Community Department has no practical natural environmental management experience..</p> <p>Priority 5 Support the development of new accommodation infrastructure to stimulate overnight visitor stays in Ku-ring-gai</p> <p>5.3 Provide information on Council's Development and Planning website section that clearly articulate Council guidelines to provide potential developers and property owners with information to encourage quality and sustainable accommodation development that complies with Council and environmental policies and information about planning processes, development controls, local economic and community profiles and links to relevant Council information. Comment: Having the Department of Development and Regulation encouraging quality and sustainable accommodation development would create a perceived conflict of interest when assessments on these developments were carried out. Having The Department of Development and Regulation as the responsible entity is not supported. Any such promotion should be independent of this department.</p> <p>Appendix 2, Fig 1 Tourism Concepts St Ives Precinct Comment: The location of the new internal access road would unnecessarily destroy significant quality bushland. It would be better located closer to Mona Vale Road where there is a higher proportion of weeds due to earlier soil disturbance.</p> <p>Conclusion STEP would appreciate participating in any further consultation on the development of the Destination Management Plan or specific actions implementing the Plan.</p>
22	<p>I am very much in favour of promoting Ku-ring-gai's built heritage and natural bush and beauty to encourage eco-tourism and to safeguard heritage for the future.</p> <p>Among these are The Hillview Heritage precinct including the stables, Sheldon Forest, and its remnant Blue Gum High Forest.</p> <p>I would be very upset to see the Little Village Park gobbled up by more development. The Park has lovely established trees, including a Moreton Bay Fig. It could certainly do with a makeover, such as removing the hedge facing William Street, putting in new seating and plantings, and just making it more accessible. It is a very needed shady little park next to the station and will be welcomed as more housing is built in the area.</p> <p>Trees provide natural shade and cooling as our climate becomes much hotter. Our birds also need places to live and breed. Parks are so important. We are so lucky to have heritage buildings and natural bush within walking distance to train services.</p> <p>Ku-ring-gai Council's Destination Management Plan must ensure these places are restored and protected as one of Sydney's most significant eco-tourist destinations.</p> <p>I commend the Council's tourism plan to protect, restore, promote, and celebrate Kuringai's outstanding environmental values.</p>
23	<p>I was fortunate enough to have lived in the 'leafy North Shore' of the Ku-ring-gai Municipality for a period of 26 years from 1982 – 2008, whereby my children were born at the San, went to school in the area, and we lived happily as a family enjoying and valuing what the area had to offer. For the</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>past 9 years I have lived and worked in the UK and recently returned mid-February to be shocked by the changes that have been made within this period, and for this reason I would like you to hear my voice.</p> <p>In catching up with past friends in the area there appears to be much sadness, dissatisfaction and stomping of the feet as to the overdevelopment of not only our area, but Sydney as a whole. The 'Draft Destination Management Plan was brought to my attention, and from what I have read on your website, I have serious concerns as <u>to Council's approach</u> towards this end-goal. From the little that I have seen, you have completed a 12 month study concentrating on a few areas to "develop tourism in our area". My areas of concern are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Draft Plan concentrates specifically on one area being St Ives - there was no mention of other areas such as Turramurra, Lindfield, Killara, all areas of where I once lived with my family.2. The Draft Plan was conducted over a very short period of time – 12 months for such a significant piece of work is not a very long time.3. Where is the evidence? Who did you speak to, are you working with other Council's? What other models from different countries have you investigated? <p>I can tell you that the UK seem to have it right, being able to protect, by law, their beautiful forests which are a hop, skip & jump away from major towns & villages. They have a very good infrastructure that allows people to get on major roads (M), (A), and then enjoy the (B) roads that amble through the countryside. They do not have a thunder of traffic going through their suburbs.</p> <p>It appears that the overdevelopment, particularly of large, multi-storey apartments in the whole of Sydney, but particularly along the corridor of Pacific Highway is racing ahead without consideration towards the pressure being placed on the infrastructure such as Pacific Highway. I took a video of Pacific Highway, not even in peak-time and sent it to my friends in the UK and they were horrified. Believe me, there is no attraction for them to come as a tourist to this area.</p> <p>In conclusion, I no longer see the 'Leafy North Shore' to be a place where I will invest my money, time or effort and so my stay here will be short-lived and I am considering retiring to Adelaide – they seem to have it right there. My advice for you, as a group of people who are about to make some serious decisions is to stop, take the time and do this properly. Take a wider-view of what you want to achieve, take longer to make these serious decisions, work with other Council's within Sydney and look at other countries/models and see how you can incorporate these ideas into the Australian way.</p>
24	<p>Marian Street Theatre The Natural Destination for Visitors to Ku-ring-gai</p> <p>Drilling down through the draft destination management plan there seem to be only three main categories for tourism experiences in Ku-ring-gai: bushwalking, the St Ives precinct, and architectural heritage tours.</p> <p>There is some mention of sporting activities and certainly the Ku-ring-gai Aquatic Centre (which scores an honourable mention) is a top-class facility, although given the existence of equivalent venues in Hornsby, Ryde and North Sydney. I'm not sure why people from those LGAs would travel to West Pymble to swim.</p> <p>St Ives Showground is described as 'under-utilised', but there is one other asset Ku-ring-gai Council owns that is so under-utilised it makes the showground seem like the Opera House: the Marian Street Theatre (MST).</p> <p>If re-opened to professional theatre, it is estimated some 50,000 people* would attend performances at MST each year. Sixty per cent of them, or 30,000 people, would be visitors to Ku-ring-gai. This alone would increase Ku-ring-gai's profile as a destination by almost 10 per cent, given current</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>visitation levels of just 344,000 visitors per annum.</p> <p>It is unlikely whether packaging and promoting “unique niche heritage experiences and stories for visitors related to Ku-ring-gai’s strong colonial heritage” (in itself questionable compared to Parramatta or The Hills) would be as significant a drawcard – yet MST is not mentioned in the draft plan.</p> <p>What is suggested is opening a regional art gallery ‘that engages and promotes local artists’. Fantastic idea. And the best place for it would be a revitalised Marian Street Theatre. Indeed, why restrict the gallery to works by <i>local</i> artists? Broadening its parameters would surely attract significantly more visitors to Ku-ring-gai.</p> <p>The plan also talks about attracting new contemporary hospitality operations. We’d certainly go along with that. A fine meal plus a dose of David Williamson equal a night to remember. All here in Ku-ring-gai.</p> <p>The Marian Street Theatre is uniquely placed to take advantage of all this.</p> <p>The plan spruiks “key festivals and events” as something to be promoted, but MST offers a year-round festival and event. Indeed, properly promoted it could be the catalyst for the longer-stay tourism the plan envisages attracting. There’s ample parking on-site and nearby; it’s right next to Killara station so public transport couldn’t be better; it’s adjacent to Selkirk Park, which could be used for outdoor performances; and it’s also close to Gordon Golf Course, the St Ives precinct, Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park and Lane Cove National Park. There’s even a motel (the Killara Inn) within easy walking distance.</p> <p>If Council genuinely wants to bring visitors into Ku-ring-gai it <u>must</u> provide culture as well as nature. The plan itself talks about promoting ‘cultural precincts’. The Save Marian Street masterplan envisages MST being a cultural precinct in its own right – and something that will complement the existing nature-focused experiences described at length in the draft plan.</p> <p>This is too good an opportunity for KMC to miss. A bushwalking focused tourism plan will attract some visitors to the municipality, but miss tens of thousands more. Council needs more than one string to its bow. That extra string – already in existence but in need of some fine-tuning - is the Marian Street Theatre – an established venue with a rich history which would augment and complement tourism in Ku-ring-gai.</p>
25	<p>Submission on the Ku-ring-gai Destination Management Plan 2017 – 2020.</p> <p>In reviewing the exhibited Ku-ring-gai Destination Management Plan there were several matters of serious concern. Taken overall, I object to the plan as exhibited for the following reasons.</p> <p>1 The Tourist Vision statement and Tourism Values fail to adequately consider the community's vision for Ku-ring-gai, which includes the protection of its outstanding natural areas and heritage for future generations.</p> <p>The introduction of the word viable means that development will yield a positive net economic return on the project cost. The bottom line in any public private partnership regarding a proposed development will be an acceptable profit margin for the private developer. Given the current shortage of funding for development and infrastructure the public sector will not be in a strong bargaining position and it will be the developer who will be able to set the profit margin. An example of this can be seen with the extra height amendments the developer was able to get for the casino development on public land at Barangaroo. The same problems will likely apply to tourist facilities that are developed and operated under a public private partnership arrangement. Environmental considerations will take second place. In the new strategic planning environment this could lead to damaging tourism development in Ku-ring-gai’s many sensitive environmental areas.</p> <p>For E1 and E2 zones, conservation of the natural environment should take priority. This is consistent with the community’s vision of protection of its outstanding natural areas and heritage for future generations. This protection should be clearly articulated in the Tourism Vision statement and</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

Tourism Values. An example can be seen in Eurobodalla's Tourism Vision Statement:

Cooperate and support each other to achieve a sustainable and innovative tourism economic sector that: preserves our natural environment, fosters support from our community, celebrates and offers diverse and quality visitor experiences related to our natural environment, culture and heritage, and welcomes and cares for our visitors.

2 Best Practice for Tourism proposed for the St Ives Precinct would not satisfy Ecologically Sustainable Development under the Environment Protection and Assessment Act 1979 in areas zoned E1 or E2.

The reason is that Tourism is orientated to commercial outcomes, while development and high human use of environmentally sensitive areas can introduce long term threatening impacts that may not be readily known at the time. For example high overseas tourist use of new tracks into previously undisturbed areas has the potential to introduce new pathogens from other parts of the world that can prove devastating to local native flora and fauna populations. This risk is being compounded by the stress many ecosystems are now experiencing from climate change. Further, on the east coast of Australia many native vegetation communities are fire dependent and have special management needs. After fire they are particularly vulnerable to disturbance and require extended periods to recover. Unlike the location of the three Capes Track in Tasmania, the landscape around the Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park by its very nature is going to be subject to long cycle usage fluctuations related to the periodic cycle of drought / bushfire and flooding rains. The primary reason of setting aside National Parks, Nature reserves and local bushland reserves was to protect our natural ecosystems and biodiversity for future generations. This will now be put at risk by creating an economic dependency on a natural resource not suited to continual high local and international tourist use. Once the environmental integrity of an area is damaged it can be very costly and time consuming to restore it.

- For E2 zones there should be no net environmental impact, either from works within the zone, or from development in adjoining areas within the precinct.
- The impact of all development within the RE1 zones should be fully contained within that zone and core areas of Duffys Forest should be fully protected.

3 The St Ives Precinct is unsuitable as a primary tourist attraction.

The Ku-ring-gai Region should be promoted and branded as the Primary Tourism product and not the specific site at St Ives. This latter site is remote and likely to suffer transport access problems as traffic congestion grows with rapidly increasing population. The broader region of Ku-ring-gai, including its special events, heritage railway station precincts, golf courses, St Ives Showground and Regional and National Parks should be promoted as a single centrally located iconic package that links those attractions with those of surrounding areas such as Willoughby, Lane Cove and Hornsby. That gives it a tourism scale that the St Ives Precinct by itself could never achieve. This is particularly important given the fluctuations in the suitability of the natural attractions around St Ives as a result of high frequency bushfire. Ku-ring-gai is at the centre of the North Shore and the railway provides the vital linkage to the outstanding attractions of the area, including the railway crossing of the Hawkesbury River and direct rail linkages to outstanding boat cruises along the Hawkesbury River, Pittwater and even including Sydney Harbour. That total linkage provides the potential for a rich diversity and continuity of tourism experiences, which if properly promoted, would put the Ku-ring-gai Region as the Primary Tourism Destination and St Ives as a Secondary one. Importantly the economic benefits from tourism would be spread more evenly around the railway centres and St Ives with less usage pressure being placed on any one natural area.

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>4 The St Ives Precinct includes Crown Land with quite different dedicated purposes and specialised management issues and would be unsuited to the proposed management under a single Trust.</p> <p>The Wildflower Garden is Crown Land that has been dedicated for the purpose of promotion of the study and preservation of native flora and fauna. This is quite different from the St Ives Showground which was dedicated for public recreation and showground. The specialised management requirements of fire dependent native flora on skeletal low fertility soils at the Wildflower Garden would make any proposed management of the sites under a single trust problematic and is not supported.</p>
26	<p>Comments on Ku-ring-gai Destination Management Plan from Australian Plants Society</p> <p>The Australian Plants Society North Shore Group (APS) has had a close relationship with Council since the 1960's in the development of the Ku-ring-gai Wildflower Garden (KWG). As such, we have an intimate knowledge of the Garden and have contributed in time and money to the provision and use of its facilities. We have reviewed the Destination Management Plan (DMP) and offer the following comments:</p> <p>We found the Plan difficult to read. It is full of big words, vague aspirational phrases and generalities. Many paragraphs had to be read 2 or 3 times to guess at their meaning. Writing like this is a waste of time and an insult to readers. It should have been sent back to the authors to be replaced with a "plain English" version.</p> <p>Council's priorities. We think Council's first priority is to provide services to support residents. Once that has been achieved, increasing the number of tourists and capturing their money might be a legitimate option. The DMP proposes a large amount of work for existing Council staff and a large expenditure. At present, APS has difficulty getting basic maintenance done in KWG. We are concerned this situation will worsen if resources are deflected to implementing the DMP.</p> <p>Loss of bushland. APS has no problem with enhancement of the land near the existing showground to increase tourism. However there is a large area between the showground and the Wildflower Garden that is pristine bushland. Such bushland under Council control is rare and valuable in terms of biodiversity and natural beauty. It must not be degraded by construction of facilities for tourists other than things like walking tracks and signage. Section 4 of the Plan says that any development should be sustainable, protecting the natural environment. We trust Council will strictly abide by this.</p> <p>Area of KWG. The APS has always regarded KWG to be the whole area between the western boundary of the Precinct to Tree Fern Gully Creek, not the much smaller area of green hatching in Figure 1. We think Figure 1 is wrong.</p> <p>Future of FWG. The whole of the KWG area (as above) should be retained as an area of passive recreation, free from activities like mountain bikes, climbing ropes, loud music etc. It should be an area for bushwalking, family picnics, looking at and learning about native bush, birds and animals, quiet contemplation. Our strong view is that as Sydney becomes more developed, the Garden will be increasingly sought after as a sanctuary of peace and quiet, allowing people to relax and rejuvenate physically and mentally.</p> <p>Precinct Master Plan. Under "Transport Access", we do not support the closure of the current access road to KWG. Entry from St Ives causes no traffic issues. Likewise exit and turning left on to Mona Vale Road causes no issues. Exit and turning right is more difficult, but to our knowledge, there has not been a significant number of accidents when doing so. We do agree that traffic noise from Mona Vale Road "affects the quality of the visitor experience". We would like to see the construction of a noise wall to minimise traffic noise.</p>
27	<p>Saving our Species (SOS), Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH)</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>The endangered orchid <i>Genoplesium baueri</i> is actively being monitored and managed as part of SOS OEH by me and is the subject of a higher degree research project at Macquarie University.</p> <p>Ku-ring-gai Wildflower Garden is one of two management sites in the northern suburbs of Sydney and it has the largest documented population of this endangered species and has been monitored and managed yearly since 2009. The endangered orchid is located in two areas along Browns Trail and also in the fenced area on the corner of Browns Trail and the management road from KWG to St Ives Showground.</p> <p>Conservation status of <i>Genoplesium baueri</i> is NSW: Endangered Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 Commonwealth: Endangered Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act)</p> <p><i>Ku-ring-gai Council is a partner in this SOS project and is required to uphold <i>Genoplesium baueri</i> preservation and to seek to expand the population by surveying potential habitat in the vicinity.</i></p> <p>Species listed and found in the Ku-ring-gai Wildflower Garden include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Melaleuca deanei</i> F. Muell. (Vulnerable under the NSW <i>Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995</i>)• <i>Genoplesium baueri</i> – newly discovered in the Garden (listed as Endangered under EPBC Act 1999)• <i>Varanus rosenbergi</i> (Heath monitor) (Vulnerable in NSW)• <i>Origma solitaria</i> Rock Warbler (Limited distribution)• <i>Angophora crassifolia</i> (Limited distribution)• <i>Ninox strenua</i> (Vulnerable in NSW)• <i>Pseudophryne australis</i> Red-crowned Toadlet (Vulnerable in NSW) <p>The presence of these rare species increases the eco-tourism potential for the precinct BUT management must succeed in preserving the species.</p> <p>Building or constructing infrastructure within the probable habitat of these species may lead to a reduction in available habitat.</p> <p>Please take care to protect the very environment and endangered species that would be a draw-card for eco-tourism.</p>
28	<p>I would like to add my comments to this plan or vision statement for the LGA. As a Ku-ring-Gai resident, a member of the Australian Plant Society and a professional ecologist I would like to add my concerns to those of (Name Withheld) and the APS submission.</p> <p>The plan is expressed in almost abstract language with very general and vague aspirations. I would like to emphasise the view that Council should, first and foremost, be addressing the desires and needs of its rate paying constituents. I also wish to stress that the precinct that encompasses the Wildflower Gardens and the showground is a special place with high biodiversity values, as (Name Withheld) points out. The conservation of this area should be paramount and filling it with new infrastructure including roads and new trails should be only done with utmost caution. The idea of new buildings or cafes or conference centres would compromise the natural values of the precinct. Endangered species like the ground orchid <i>Genoplesium baueri</i> is cryptic and spends part of the year beneath the soil. Hence it is easily missed by surveys and may occur throughout the bushland of this area.</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

Project live on the site from 15 April to 22 May

	Comments from online engagement platform
1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft Destination Management Plan (DDMP) on exhibition fails to mention some important issues to be addressed for this document to clearly inform ratepayers of the impacts of the proposals. It should give a more balanced perspective rather than be 'style without substance.' • The DDMP states the intent is to 'provide strategic direction for Council to plan for the sustainable management, development and marketing of tourism in Ku-ring-gai over the next four-years to 2020. • What is sustainable management and how it is it defined? This strategic plan to be undertaken could demonstrate that sustainable management of the Showground Precinct is not compatible with 'development and marketing of tourism'. Thus the real cost of truly sustainable deliverables must be considered at the earliest stages. At the very least, include the 'detailed development of sustainable management strategies' as a consideration in 5.0 Key Priorities to 2020. This DDMP must have a strategic direction that complies with Councils existing sustainability and management plans, and not ignore it as is the current situation. The DDMP only refers to the 'development and marketing of tourism' section of the intent and fails to address anything else. The DDMP states that 'In developing this Plan careful consideration has been given to ensure that the development and promotion of tourism celebrates and protects Kuring-gai's distinctive natural and built environments whilst providing benefits for the local community'. • This 'careful consideration' that ensures the protection of the 'distinctive natural and built environments' is a key priority and must be realistically valued and funded in this Management Plan. The process for careful consideration should be provided to ensure transparency and compliance with Council's legislative requirements. (Suggest the use of the word 'conserve' instead of 'protect' because it defines a better level of protection for St Ives Precinct. 'Conservation' means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance, whereas 'protection' is maintenance, cleaning, repair, and asset renewal.')(Burra Charter)) • The report to the Ordinary Meeting of Council - 4 April 2017 states that 'There are no environmental issues associated with the writing of this report. Environmental matters associated with sustainable tourism and events have been considered within the draft DMP.' Can you please advise where this is considered in the DDMP? Environmental issues associated with sustainable tourism are not clearly discussed anywhere in the presented DDMP. Please advise how and when these will be addressed and if they will be included in the DDMP. • The showground site is one of the last remaining areas of Duffys Forest, an Endangered Ecological Community. This EEC should be addressed in this document, identified and mapped. Managing impacts on the EEC are mandatory and yet it is not mentioned. The remnant Laterite soil is part of this sensitive ecology. • The showground has cultural significance as Sydney's longest continually used showground. How will this use and character identified in the

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>Council adopted Plan of Management be retained and still accommodate new development and landuse?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing user groups such as Equestrian Field users and sports users are already bringing people from beyond Ku-ring-gai, and the showground serves a growing passive recreation population. Are you proposing to relocate these users to another site within Ku-ring-gai to make room for hotels and accommodation? The existing sportsfield demand is already greater than supply in Ku-ring-gai and increasing population from increased housing densities will exacerbate this. Can you confirm the existing sporting use will be retained at the showground, including horse events? • Will the site be inclusive for users? An eco-resort of five star+ accommodation (similar to Kangaroo Island) could alienate much of this current public open space and possibly in an area with the best views. The introduction of a five star+ resort will introducing a level of elitism to the site which does not comply with the core use of crown lands. • The report fails to mention the existing accommodation such as Killara Motor Inn, the new accommodation being built in Gordon and the conference centre at Naamaroo. This needs to be included to be a correct record. • The traffic and transport implications of developing the St Ives Precinct is not addressed other than discussion of traffic lights which are needed, (and have been previously identified, but remain unfunded by Council). How tourists will get to the St Ives Precinct is not mentioned. The existing poor traffic flow along many of the key roads servicing the St Ives Precinct has not been considered. A 40 minute drive from Sydney City is suggested which does not consider time of day, weekend and holiday traffic gridlock. There is no viable public transport other than local bus without designated support infrastructure or inclusive access. Is the transport links issue for tourism being addressed at all as a priority? • The plan in the DDMP report shows some items but fails to show others, such as five-star Eco resorts (similar to King Island), aboriginal heritage museums, increased parking, camping.etc . Can ratepayers be assured that essential constraints will be considered to locate these elements, such as asset protection and flame zone impacts, EEC and threatened species' impacts, vulnerable remnant laterite soils, visual catchment impacts, cultural heritage, access and inclusion, and infrastructure provision? Previous planning documents to provide an education centre at KWG were scrapped by Council when these were not considered, at wasted cost to ratepayers. • Water supply is very poor at the Showground site and the need to upgrade the water main is not mentioned. This will also be a significant need and costly constraint.
2)	<p>I believe that the Plan should take into account the rich equestrian culture of the area. Kuringgai offers a unique experience to horse owners and equestrians as it is located in a central area, whilst having the space, natural environment and community to support this.</p> <p>Please take into consideration the equestrian community when reviewing the Plan. Northside Riding Club, which is based in the St Ives Showground, is a much loved part of the local and equestrian community and the Plan, which aims to increase festivals and events, etc. can potentially have negative impacts on not only the club, but the wider equestrian community.</p>
3)	<p>There is no mention of maintaining and further delveloping horse riding facilities and trails in this proposal - these events provide a source of regular visitors to the area for horse competition and training and should be supported - I am moving to Terrey hills for this very reason. It is a unique</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	situation when potentially world class horse riding trails are available within 40mins of the cbd and further potential tourist endeavours should acknowledge and support this attraction fully.
4)	There does not appear to be anything in the plan recognising how important the current equestrian activities are to both the local community, history of the areas of the economy (ie generated from events and people travelling to the area).
5)	I hope that the current grounds and activities managed by Northside Riding Club stay as an integral part of life and sports at St Ives Showground? I moved to the area because of the easy access to horses and horse activity at St Ives - one of the few areas within the Sydney area with the space and the people to undertake horse riding clinics, events and functions.
6)	As members of Northside Riding Club, my family and I are frequent user of the equestrian facilities at St Ives Showgrounds. I have met so many wonderful people who travel to the Princess Anne equestrian grounds within the St Ives showground, including people from all over the state and occasionally interstate. It is a wonderful facility and a real jewel in the crown of Kuringai. I trust that this use will continue in the new Destination Management Plan.
7)	I am a fellow member at Northside riding club and I would hate to see it have to close. I range from photographing for there events to competing and it is such a amazing comitte. There are so many equestrians that use st ives show ground and I don't know where we would go or end up without it. Please don't take this away from us
8)	Having been a volunteer and a rider with Northside riding club for the last 10years, and seen the goodwill and community benefit of having the riding club at the show ground I am very disappointed that there is no mention of continuing to develop the riding club for the community and the riders who love and cherish there time at the show ground. The club supports many charities as well as para equestrians, who have a safe and controlled environment to ride in. Northside has also been the beginnings of many of our top equestrian Olympic atheletes... I hope the council reconsiders and continues to support the unique club in its activities.
9)	We have tourist areas already. We don't need more. We can't take the traffic. It appears the pressure for this is coming from State Government. Let's utilize and realise existing sites and create awareness of others eg . Hillview @ Turramurra (steeped in history) Sheldon Forest. Bobbin Head . I hope this push for this plan does not allow for opening up our National Parks for development
10)	Drilling down through the draft destination management plan there seem to be only three main categories for tourism experiences in Ku-ring-gai: bushwalking, the St Ives precinct, and architectural heritage tours. There is some mention of sporting activities and certainly the Ku-ring-gai Aquatic Centre (which scores an honourable mention) is a top-class facility, although given the existence of equivalent venues in Hornsby, Ryde and North Sydney. I'm not sure why people from those LGAs would travel to West Pymble to swim. St Ives Showground is described as 'under-utilised', but there is one other asset Ku-ring-gai Council owns that is so under-utilised it makes the showground seem like the Opera House: the Marian Street Theatre (MST). If re-opened to professional theatre, it is estimated some 50,000 people* would attend performances at MST each year. Sixty per cent of them, or 30,000 people, would be visitors to Ku-ring-gai. This alone would increase Ku-ring-gai's profile as a destination by almost 10 per cent, given current visitation levels of just 344,000 visitors per annum. It is unlikely whether packaging and promoting "unique niche heritage experiences and stories for visitors related to Ku-ring-gai's strong colonial heritage" (in itself questionable compared to Parramatta or The Hills) would be as significant a drawcard – yet MST is not mentioned in the draft plan. What is suggested is opening a regional art gallery 'that engages and promotes local artists'. Fantastic idea. And the best place for it would be a revitalised Marian Street Theatre. Indeed, why restrict the gallery to works by local artists? Broadening its parameters would surely attract significantly more visitors to Ku-ring-gai.

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>The plan also talks about attracting new contemporary hospitality operations. We'd certainly go along with that. A fine meal plus a dose of David Williamson equal a night to remember. All here in Ku-ring-gai.</p> <p>The Marian Street Theatre is uniquely placed to take advantage of all this.</p> <p>The plan spruiks "key festivals and events" as something to be promoted, but MST offers a year-round festival and event. Indeed, properly promoted it could be the catalyst for the longer-stay tourism the plan envisages attracting. There's ample parking on-site and nearby; it's right next to Killara station so public transport couldn't be better; it's adjacent to Selkirk Park, which could be used for outdoor performances; and it's also close to Gordon Golf Course, the St Ives precinct, Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park and Lane Cove National Park. There's even a motel (the Killara Inn) within easy walking distance.</p> <p>If Council genuinely wants to bring visitors into Ku-ring-gai it must provide culture as well as nature. The plan itself talks about promoting 'cultural precincts'. The Save Marian Street masterplan envisages MST being a cultural precinct in its own right – and something that will complement the existing nature-focused experiences described at length in the draft plan.</p> <p>This is too good an opportunity for KMC to miss. A bushwalking focused tourism plan will attract some visitors to the municipality, but miss tens of thousands more. Council needs more than one string to its bow. That extra string – already in existence but in need of some fine-tuning - is the Marian Street Theatre – an established venue with a rich history which would augment and complement tourism in Ku-ring-gai.</p>
11)	<p>Drilling down through the draft destination management plan there seem to be only three main categories for tourism experiences in Ku-ring-gai: bushwalking, the St Ives precinct, and architectural heritage tours.</p> <p>There is some mention of sporting activities and certainly the Ku-ring-gai Aquatic Centre (which scores an honourable mention) is a top-class facility, although given the existence of equivalent venues in Hornsby, Ryde and North Sydney. I'm not sure why people from those LGAs would travel to West Pymble to swim.</p> <p>St Ives Showground is described as 'under-utilised', but there is one other asset Ku-ring-gai Council owns that is so under-utilised it makes the showground seem like the Opera House: the Marian Street Theatre (MST).</p> <p>If re-opened to professional theatre, it is estimated some 50,000 people* would attend performances at MST each year. Sixty per cent of them, or 30,000 people, would be visitors to Ku-ring-gai. This alone would increase Ku-ring-gai's profile as a destination by almost 10 per cent, given current visitation levels of just 344,000 visitors per annum.</p> <p>It is unlikely whether packaging and promoting "unique niche heritage experiences and stories for visitors related to Ku-ring-gai's strong colonial heritage" (in itself questionable compared to Parramatta or The Hills) would be as significant a drawcard – yet MST is not mentioned in the draft plan.</p> <p>What is suggested is opening a regional art gallery 'that engages and promotes local artists'. Fantastic idea. And the best place for it would be a revitalised Marian Street Theatre. Indeed, why restrict the gallery to works by local artists? Broadening its parameters would surely attract significantly more visitors to Ku-ring-gai.</p> <p>The plan also talks about attracting new contemporary hospitality operations. We'd certainly go along with that. A fine meal plus a dose of David Williamson equal a night to remember. All here in Ku-ring-gai.</p> <p>The Marian Street Theatre is uniquely placed to take advantage of all this.</p> <p>The plan spruiks "key festivals and events" as something to be promoted, but MST offers a year-round festival and event. Indeed, properly promoted it could be the catalyst for the longer-stay tourism the plan envisages attracting. There's ample parking on-site and nearby; it's right next to Killara station so public transport couldn't be better; it's adjacent to Selkirk Park, which could be used for outdoor performances; and it's also close to Gordon Golf Course, the St Ives precinct, Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park and Lane Cove National Park. There's even a motel (the Killara Inn) within easy walking distance.</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>If Council genuinely wants to bring visitors into Ku-ring-gai it must provide culture as well as nature. The plan itself talks about promoting 'cultural precincts'. The Save Marian Street masterplan envisages MST being a cultural precinct in its own right – and something that will complement the existing nature-focused experiences described at length in the draft plan.</p> <p>This is too good an opportunity for KMC to miss. A bushwalking focused tourism plan will attract some visitors to the municipality, but miss tens of thousands more. Council needs more than one string to its bow. That extra string – already in existence but in need of some fine-tuning - is the Marian Street Theatre – an established venue with a rich history which would augment and complement tourism in Ku-ring-gai.</p>
12)	<p>I encourage Council to extend its Plan to highlight arts and culture: they attract visitors. Re-opening Marian St Theatre is a key to future success. At Macquarie, we developed the leafy campus as an arts centre. Large numbers of people came regularly to the university from all over Sydney to visit art and museum exhibitions, with shows based on my personal Aboriginal Art Collection (with explanatory talks) also attracting visitors from overseas. Our resident trio, Macquarie Trio Australia, easily sold out its subscription series on campus, as did the Balmain Sinfonia. Guest theatre productions and the Sydney Writers' series of talks added new audiences.</p> <p>Hundreds of visitors poured in for the annual 'Big Draw Day', enjoying drawing and art workshops, including in the campus' spacious parklands. We made it easy for our committed arts lovers: they could choose from a varied offering of arts activities; park on campus (and later, travel conveniently by train); get a snack or meal on campus, or just across the road; they could even book a room in conveniently located hotels.</p> <p>One of my arts boards these days is SIMA, the jazz association, which, in addition to regular gigs, workshops and the big Sydney International Women's Jazz Festival, mounts the Berry Jazz Festival in May. People come from all over Sydney for that too, staying at local hotels. SIMA plans to tour the Berry Festival to other venues, and I'm encouraging them to consider MST at Killara.</p> <p>Killara has everything needed to attract visitors as an arts and cultural centre—or could have when Marian Street Theatre is upgraded & re-opened: theatre spaces, excellent exhibiting venues, great gigs for jazz, a lovely adjacent park, exceptional access with a station and carpark virtually next door, coffee bars across the road, and a hotel within walking distance—let's go for it!</p>
13)	<p>In reviewing the exhibited Ku-ring-gai Destination Management Plan there were several matters of serious concern. Taken overall, I object to the plan as exhibited for the following reasons.</p> <p>1 The Tourist Vision statement and Tourism Values fail to adequately consider the community's vision for Ku-ring-gai, which includes the protection of its outstanding natural areas and heritage for future generations.</p> <p>The introduction of the word viable means that development will yield a positive net economic return on the project cost. The bottom line in any public private partnership regarding a proposed development will be an acceptable profit margin for the private developer. Given the current shortage of funding for development and infrastructure the public sector will not be in a strong bargaining position and it will be the developer who will be able to set the profit margin. An example of this can be seen with the extra height amendments the developer was able to get for the casino development on public land at Barangaroo. The same problems will likely apply to tourist facilities that are developed and operated under a public private partnership arrangement. Environmental considerations will take second place. In the new strategic planning environment this could lead to damaging tourism development in Ku-ring-gai's many sensitive environmental areas.</p>

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

For E1 and E2 zones, conservation of the natural environment should take priority. This is consistent with the community's vision of protection of its outstanding natural areas and heritage for future generations. This protection should be clearly articulated in the Tourism Vision statement and Tourism Values. An example can be seen in Eurobodalla's Tourism Vision Statement:
Cooperate and support each other to achieve a sustainable and innovative tourism economic sector that: preserves our natural environment, fosters support from our community, celebrates and offers diverse and quality visitor experiences related to our natural environment, culture and heritage, and welcomes and cares for our visitors.

2) Best Practice for Tourism proposed for the St Ives Precinct would not satisfy Ecologically Sustainable Development under the Environment Protection and Assessment Act 1979 in areas zoned E1 or E2.

The reason is that Tourism is orientated to commercial outcomes, while development and high human use of environmentally sensitive areas can introduce long term threatening impacts that may not be readily known at the time. For example high overseas tourist use of new tracks into previously undisturbed areas has the potential to introduce new pathogens from other parts of the world that can prove devastating to local native flora and fauna populations. This risk is being compounded by the stress many ecosystems are now experiencing from climate change. Further, on the east coast of Australia many native vegetation communities are fire dependent and have special management needs. After fire they are particularly vulnerable to disturbance and require extended periods to recover. Unlike the location of the three Capes Track in Tasmania, the landscape around the Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park by its very nature is going to be subject to long cycle usage fluctuations related to the periodic cycle of drought / bushfire and flooding rains. The primary reason of setting aside National Parks, Nature reserves and local bushland reserves was to protect our natural ecosystems and biodiversity for future generations. This will now be put at risk by creating an economic dependency on a natural resource not suited to continual high local and international tourist use. Once the environmental integrity of an area is damaged it can be very costly and time consuming to restore it.

- For E2 zones there should be no net environmental impact, either from works within the zone, or from development in adjoining areas within the precinct.
- The impact of all development within the RE1 zones should be fully contained within that zone and core areas of Duffys Forest should be fully protected.

3 The St Ives Precinct is unsuitable as a primary tourist attraction.

The Ku-ring-gai Region should be promoted and branded as the Primary Tourism product and not the specific site at St Ives. This latter site is remote and likely to suffer transport access problems as traffic congestion grows with rapidly increasing population. The broader region of Ku-ring-gai, including its special events, heritage railway station precincts, golf courses, St Ives Showground and Regional and National Parks should be promoted as a single centrally located iconic package that links those attractions with those of surrounding areas such as Willoughby, Lane Cove and Hornsby. That gives it a tourism scale that the St Ives Precinct by itself could never achieve.

Verbatim Written Submissions (received via Conversations Website online community engagement portal)

	<p>This is particularly important given the fluctuations in the suitability of the natural attractions around St Ives as a result of high frequency bushfire. Ku-ring-gai is at the centre of the North Shore and the railway provides the vital linkage to the outstanding attractions of the area, including the railway crossing of the Hawkesbury River and direct rail linkages to outstanding boat cruises along the Hawkesbury River, Pittwater and even including Sydney Harbour. That total linkage provides the potential for a rich diversity and continuity of tourism experiences, which if properly promoted, would put the Ku-ring-gai Region as the Primary Tourism Destination and St Ives as a Secondary one. Importantly the economic benefits from tourism would be spread more evenly around the railway centres and St Ives with less usage pressure being placed on any one natural area.</p> <p>4 The St Ives Precinct includes Crown Land with quite different dedicated purposes and specialised management issues and would be unsuited to the proposed management under a single Trust.</p> <p>The Wildflower Garden is Crown Land that has been dedicated for the purpose of promotion of the study and preservation of native flora and fauna. This is quite different from the St Ives Showground which was dedicated for public recreation and showground. The specialised management requirements of fire dependent native flora on skeletal low fertility soils at the Wildflower Garden would make any proposed management of the sites under a single trust problematic and is not supported.</p>
14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the development of a Destination Plan for St Ives precinct • Draft Plan makes very little reference to current community & tourist uses of St Ives Showground (eg horse shows, dog shows, annual St Ives Show) & the out of area people attracted by such events • Destination Plan should outline how the current activities will be better promoted by Council & improved to increase the value add to Ku-ring-gai Council area. • Given the importance of the historical agricultural function of the St Ives Showground, as identified in the Draft Plan, the Northern Suburbs Agricultural & Horticultural Society should be a member of the proposed Events Management team.
15)	<p>St Ives show ground sits, as this plan recognises, in an area of outstanding natural beauty that many would like to enjoy. However the vegetation around the show ground is the endangered Duffy's Forest ecological community. This is already compromised by the show ground and the activities there. The plan should recognise that any future development of the site should</p> <p>Not involve any further clearing of the native vegetation.</p> <p>Enhance the existing plant community that the visitors come to enjoy perhaps by sensitive bush regeneration work and/or weed mitigation measures</p>