



# Ordinary Council Meeting

**Agenda:** *Ordinary Council Meeting*

**Date:** *Monday 25 August 2008*

**Time:** *8.00pm*

# Woollahra Municipal Council

## Notice of Meeting

21 August 2008

To: His Worship The Mayor, Councillor Geoff Rundle  
Councillors Anthony Boskovitz  
John Comino  
Claudia Cullen  
Christopher Dawson  
Marcus Ehrlich  
Tanya Excell  
Wilhelmina Gardner  
Keri Huxley  
Julian Martin  
Andrew Petrie  
Isabelle Shapiro  
David Shoebridge  
Fiona Sinclair King  
John Walker

Dear Councillors

### **Council Meeting – 25 August 2008**

In accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1993, I request your attendance at Council's **Ordinary Council Meeting** to be held in the **Council Chambers, 536 New South Head Road, Double Bay, on Monday 25 August 2008 at 8.00pm.**

Gary James  
General Manager

## Meeting Agenda

		Page
1.	Confirmation of Minutes – Ordinary Meeting	11 August 2008
2.	Leave of Absence and Apologies	
3.	Declarations of Interest	
4.	Late Correspondence	
5.	Petitions Tabled	
6.	Mayoral Minute	Nil
7.	Public Forum	
8.	General Manager’s Report	Nil
9.	Reports of the Committees	
9.1	Corporate & Works Committee	18 August 2008
	R1 Wingadal Place Seawall Reconstruction	
	R2 Capital Project Status Report & Revotes	
	R3 New Model Code of Conduct for Local Councils in NSW	
	R4 104 Hopetoun Avenue, Vaucluse - Encroachment Removal Options	
9.2	Development Control Committee	18 August 2008
	R1 DA14/2008 – 59 Manning Road, Double Bay – Demolition of existing dwelling-house & ancillary structures, subdivision of the site into 2 allotments & erection of 2 new dwelling-houses – 16/1/2008	3
	R2 DA219/2008 – 4 Warren Road, Bellevue Hill – Alterations & additions to dwelling & new driveway with garage to the front boundary – 21/4/2008	4
9.3	Urban Planning Committee	11 August 2008
	R1 Art of Median Strip at Bayswater	
	R2 Pedestrian and Vehicle Links in the Rose Bay Centre DCP	
	R3 DA process regarding hoardings & screening devices	
9.4	Community & Environment Committee - <b>Nil R Items</b>	11 August 2008
10.	Rescission Motion	Nil
11.	Notices of Motion	7
12.	Questions without Notice	8

---

## 9.1 Corporate & Works Committee

---

### Items with Recommendations from the Committee Meeting of Monday 18 August 2008 Submitted to the Council for Determination

---

**Item No:** R1 Recommendation to Council  
**Subject:** **Wingadal Place Seawall Reconstruction**  
**Author:** Mark Ramsay – Manager Depot & Waste Services  
**File No:** Tender No 08/11  
**Reason for Report:** To recommend to Council the acceptance of a Tender

**Recommendation:**

- A. That the tender panel recommends that Council enter into a Contract with Stone Mason and Artist Pty Ltd for Wingadal Place Seawall Reconstruction for the sum of \$188,865 (excluding GST).
  - B. That successful and unsuccessful tenderers be advised accordingly.
- 

**Item No:** R2 Recommendation to Council  
**Subject:** **Capital Project Status Report & Revotes**  
**Author:** Michelle Phair, Team Leader Financial Services  
**File No:** 331G 2007/2008  
**Reason for Report:** To report on the status of capital projects in the 2007/2008 budget as at 30 June 2008 and recommend the revote of budget allocations for 2007/2008 projects not commenced before 30 June 2008

**Recommendation:**

- A. THAT the report on project delivery performance and the capital status update report be received and noted; and
  - B. THAT the revote of budget allocations for the projects detailed in ANNEXURES 1 and 2 to this report be adopted
-

**Item No:** R3 Recommendation to Council  
**Subject:** **New Model Code of Conduct for Local Councils in NSW**  
**Author:** Les Windle - Manager Governance  
**File No:** 817.G  
**Reason for Report:** To advise Councillors of a new Model Code of Conduct for Local Councils in NSW and recommend adoption of the Model Code of Conduct.

**Recommendation:**

- A. THAT the June 2008 Model Code of Conduct for Local Councils in NSW with the inclusion of the additional provisions specific to Woollahra Council's requirements as contained in Annexure 1 to the report to the Corporate and Works Committee on 18 August 2008 be adopted as Council's Code of Conduct.
- B. THAT a further report be submitted to Council in relation to the independent conduct reviewer/review committee requirements of the Model Code of Conduct.

---

**Item No:** R4 Recommended to Council  
**Subject:** **104 Hopetoun Avenue, Vaocluse - Encroachment Removal Options**  
**Author:** Anthony Sheedy, Property Officer  
**File No:** 240.104  
**Reason for Report:** To give consideration to the options available to have the encroachments adjoining 104 Hopetoun Avenue removed.

**Recommendation:**

- A. That the aluminium fencing and dense planting in the Road reserve are to be removed and replaced with suitable plant species, to be selected by the Manager Parks and Street Trees, the sloping verge is to be reinstated from the public footpath to the property boundary; and the existing retaining wall be reduced in height so as not to intrude above the level of the sloping verge.
- B. That all works be carried out to a landscaping plan to be developed by the Manager Parks and Street Trees, and to be at the expense of the owner of No. 104 Hopetoun Avenue, and to the satisfaction of the Director Technical Services.
- C. That the owner of 104 Hopetoun Avenue enter into a positive covenant with Council in respect of the road reserve garden landscaping and unenclosed stairs giving access to the adjoining owner's property.
- D. That Council exercise its regulatory powers as necessary to remedy the illegal works on Council roadway.
- E. That the landscape plan be submitted to the Corporate and Works Committee for approval.

---

## 9.2 Development Control Committee

---

### Items with Recommendations from the Committee Meeting of Monday 18 August 2008 Submitted to the Council for Determination

---

<b>Item No:</b>	R1 Recommendation to Council
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>59 Manning Road, Double Bay – Demolition of existing dwelling-house &amp; ancillary structures, subdivision of the site into 2 allotments &amp; erection of 2 new dwelling-houses – 16/1/2008</b>
<b>Author:</b>	David Booth – Senior Assessment Officer
<b>File No:</b>	DA14/2008
<b>Reason for Report:</b>	In accordance with Council’s meeting procedures and policy this matter is referred to full Council due to a substantive change of the Committee’s recommendation (refusal) to the officers recommendation (approval).

#### **Recommendation:**

THAT the Council, as the consent authority, refuse development consent to Development Application No. 14/2008 for the demolition of the existing dwelling-house and ancillary structures, the subdivision of the site into 2 allotments and the erection of 2 new dwelling-houses on land at 59 Manning Road Double Bay, for the following reasons:

- The development proposal does not comply with the prescribed desired future character objectives stipulated under part 4.3 of Woollahra RDCP 2003 thereby resulting in a development which does not respect or enhance the existing elements of the Wallaroy precinct.
- The development proposal does not comply with the performance criteria in relation to boundary setbacks, number of storeys, FSR, deep soil landscaping, front fence height and setback from significant tree which is stipulated under parts 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 of Woollahra RDCP 2003.
- The development proposal exhibits excessive scale and bulk to the detriment of the streetscape, context of the surrounding locality and amenity of adjoining properties.
- The development proposal will have an adverse impact upon the residential amenity of adjoining properties in terms of privacy, solar access, views and visual impact.
- Not in the public interest

**Item No:** R2 Recommendation to Council  
**Subject:** **4 Warren Road, Bellevue Hill – Alterations & additions to dwelling & new driveway with garage to the front boundary – 21/4/2008**  
**Author:** Caroline Owen - Assessment Officer  
**File No:** DA219/2008  
**Reason for Report:** In accordance with Council's meeting procedures and policy this matter is referred to full Council due to a substantive change of the Committee's recommendation (refusal) to the officers recommendation (approval).

**Recommendation:**

THAT the Council as the consent authority, refuse development consent to Development Application No. 219/2008 for alterations and additions to dwelling and new driveway with garage to the front boundary on land at 4 Warren Road Bellevue Hill, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development does not comply with the minimum side and rear setback requirements, this results in an unacceptable impact on the visual privacy of adjoining properties and does not provide sufficient separation between surrounding development, contrary to O5.2.2, C5.2.3 and C5.2.5 of Section 5.2 of the Woollahra RDCP, 2003.
  2. The proposed additional crossover to the front of the site would detract from the character and appearance of the streetscape, contrary to O5.1.3 and O5.1.5 of Section 5.1 of the Woollahra RDCP, 2003.
  3. The proposed new garage is located within the front setback, which detracts from the character and appearance of the streetscape, contrary to O5.1.3, O5.1.5, C5.1.2 of Section 5.1 and C4.7.5 (A) and (B) of Section 4.7 of the Woollahra RDCP, 2003.
  4. The proposed development results in a further non-compliance with the minimum deep soil landscaping requirements, contrary to O5.3.6 and C5.3.2 of Section 5.3 of the Woollahra RDCP, 2003.
  5. The proposed new fenestration has an adverse impact on the visual privacy of adjoining properties, contrary to O5.8.1 of Section 5.8 of the Woollahra RDCP, 2003.
-

---

## 9.3 Urban Planning Committee

---

### Items with Recommendations from the Committee Meeting of Monday 11 August 2008 Submitted to the Council for Determination

---

**Item No:** R1 Recommendation to Council  
**Subject:** Art of Median Strip at Bayswater  
**Author:** Tom Jones  
**File No:** 9--.G  
**Reason for Report:** Resolution of Urban Planning Committee

**Recommendation:**

That a Public Art section be incorporated into the future revised Edgecliff DCP, in accord with the Public Art Policy October 2006.

---

**Item No:** R2 Recommendation to Council  
**Subject:** Pedestrian and Vehicle Links in The Rose Bay Centre DCP  
**Author:** Tom Jones  
**File No:** 985.G  
**Reason for Report:** Urban Planning Committee Resolution

**Recommendation:**

That Council retain the *design principles and guidelines and controls* relating to pedestrian and vehicle links in the Rose Bay Centre DCP as they are.

---

**Item No:** R3 Delegated to Committee  
**Subject:** **DA Process Regarding Hoardings & Screening Devices**  
**Author:** Patrick Robinson – Manager Development Control  
Peter Kauter – Acting Director Planning & Development  
**File No:** 900.G  
**Reason for Report:** For information  
In accordance with Council’s meeting procedures and policy this matter is referred to full Council due to a substantive change of the Committee’s recommendation to the Officer’s recommendation.

**Recommendation:**

That Council adopt the following new condition of consent, which may be applied to development consents requiring the erection of hoardings in a commercial or retail area.

*“Any hoarding must ensure that its facia is treated in a manner which provides complete and coordinated graphic design or be painted in muted earthy tones. The facia may depict the following information:*

- *The relevant elevational image depicting the proposed development*
- *Information of community interest*
- *Artwork and graphic material of visual interest*
- *Photomontage*
- *Decorative patterns drawing, texts and illustrations*

*The facia may not be treated with graphics or artworks which are dominated by primary colours, fluro colours or the like.*

*The graphic design must not constitute advertising other than by way of general depiction of the development proposed for the site.”*

## Notices of Motion

**Item No:** 1  
**From:** Councillors Huxley & Shapiro  
**Date:** 18 August 2008  
**File No:** 900.G

That a report be brought urgently to the Urban Planning Committee which investigates the retention and protection of the walkways and lanes used by the public throughout Paddington and that Woollahra Council do all that is necessary to maintain and protect the public benefit provided by these walkways.

That Woollahra Council commit sufficient planning resources necessary for a thorough investigation into the walkways and lanes that currently provide linkages between streets and lanes used by local residents and the wider public to traverse the locality.

And that Council explore all legal avenues regarding ownership, public liability, and that Council consider taking action to acquire easements over such 'dunny lanes', walkways and lanes for the public and community benefit throughout Paddington and Woollahra.

---

**Item No:** 12  
**Subject:** Questions Without Notice  
**Author:** Gary James, General Manager  
**File No:** 467.G/Q01  
**Reason for Report:** To provide a response to Questions without Notice from Council Meeting of 11 August 2008 and for Councillors to ask Questions without Notice in accordance with Council's Code of Meeting Practice.

**Recommendation:**

That the responses to previous Questions without Notice be noted.

---

**Background:**

The provision for Councillors to ask Questions Without Notice is contained in Section 3 of Council's Code of Meeting Practice which states:

- (1) *As a standard practice, "Questions Without Notice" shall be listed in all agendas of Ordinary Meetings of Council*
- (2) *Questions shall be in writing.*
- (3) *The Mayor shall direct the question to the General Manager or responsible Division Head; or if the question is directed to another Councillor, the Councillor concerned. There shall be no requirement to answer the question immediately.*
- (4) *If the answer to a question can be given immediately then such shall be done and a record made in the Minutes of the Meeting. If an answer can be given, but not immediately, then the Mayor shall indicate to whom the question is to be directed and the basis upon which the answer is to be provided (whether in writing and direct to the Enquirer, or by means of a report to an appropriate Committee, or otherwise.)*
- (5) *In the spirit of achieving the expeditious discharge of Council business the agenda item "Questions Without Notice" shall generally be limited to not more than 30 minutes duration unless the Council determines otherwise, on the evening in question and by way of specific resolution.*

Questions Without Notice should be asked in accordance with the Code of Meeting Practice.

Responses to Councillors Questions Without Notice on 11 August 2008 are as follows:

---

**Councillor Comino asking:**

Are the temporary repairs and pothole filling on New South Head Road carried out last minute by the RTA for last Sunday's City to Surf likely to be repaired by the RTA in a more permanent way?

**Manager Engineering Services in response:**

This has been referred to Civil Works & Infrastructure to follow up with the RTA.

---

**Councillor Comino asking:**

What is the current status of the proposed replacement of chain wire fencing on New South Head Road near Council's Library?

**Manager Public Open Space in response:**

The works have commenced with the data cables linking the Chambers and the Library relocated to remove visual clutter prior to installing the fence. The new fence will be completed by the end of August and it will match the fencing style used with the Redleaf redevelopment.

---

**Councillor Comino asking:**

Are you aware the Vaucluse High School site has been sold by the Zig Inge Group to a Queensland company? Has any notice been received from either party to that transaction?

**Director Planning and Development in response:**

No, I was not aware of that transaction.

---

**Councillor Gardner asking:**

I have been advised that Council has ordered that construction on 118 Hopetoun Avenue be stopped, because of unauthorised work being done there. The builders construction material and a steel fence have been left, cluttering up the nature strip. Could Council please contact the builder and ask him to remove his debris from the nature strip forthwith?

**Manager Compliance in response:**

The property in question is 120 Hopetoun Avenue Vaucluse and development commenced on the subject site pursuant to development consent DA 314/2006. Condition No. 13 of the consent requires a tree protection fence to be erected a minimum distance of 3 metres from the street tree. This condition does not specify a maximum clearance distance. While works on the site have currently stopped, Council cannot require the removal of the tree protection fence.

However, it appears that a site fence and building materials also extend onto the footpath area without a hoarding approval or any other consent. As such, a request requiring these items to be removed from the nature strip, has been created in Council's Customer Request Management system, reference number CRM 10096857/2008 and referred to Council's Team Leader - Compliance for follow-up.

---

**Councillor Sinclair King asking:**

Mr Tuchin keeps writing to you, Councillor Dawson and I about the barking dogs in Marathon Mews. I have tendered a letter and request that it be followed up.

**Manager Compliance in response:**

This matter was been referred to Council's Solicitors.

---

**Councillor Sinclair King asking:**

The owner of 45A Bay Street Double Bay has complained that the pavement is becoming a trip hazard.

**Mayor in response:**

That is also being attended to. If you had read your papers last Friday, that has been corrected.

**Manager of Civil Works & Infrastructure further in response:**

Works to restore the path in Bay Street have commenced. The responsibility of maintaining temporary restorations is the responsibility of the utility service provider until such time we provide a permanent repair of the area. We have inspected the temporary restorations in Double Bay with representatives from Enerserve (Energy Australia's contractor). We raised our concerns regarding the state of the temporary restoration provided, identified where corrective repairs were necessary, and have requested Enerserve to repair these areas immediately. If Enerserve fails to undertake the repairs to our requirements we will arrange for the repairs to be completed and pass on our costs to Energy Australia.

---

**Councillor Sinclair King asking:**

Could Council enforce the DA condition relating to the current operation of the Marina at Double Bay whereby public access and thoroughfare would be made available along the entire beach? Currently there is a locked door on a fixed inaccessible pontoon at the Marina and members of the public are unable to walk the entire length of the beach.

**Manager Compliance in response:**

The concern identified in the above Question Without Notice (QWN) has been recorded in Council's Customer Request Management system, reference number CRM 10096847/2008 and referred to Council's Development Compliance Officer. Furthermore, the issue has been raised in the current assessment of development application DA 844/2007 for the redevelopment of the Double Bay Marina.

Our initial research indicates that there was an approval granted by the Maritime Services Board in 1985 to redevelop the marina berths which is relevant. The Board's letter dated 2 April 1985 contains conditions of approval including:

---

"(m) steps to be provided at the western side of the structure to improve the access along the foreshore consistent with the existing requirement under the lease. Detailed drawings of the steps are to be submitted for Board's approval"; and

"(xviii) a suitable clause to permit free and uninterrupted passage over the strip of land 3.6 metres wide immediately below high water mark, shown by green hatching on the enclosed plan, together with any structures erected thereon;"

As the 1985 consent was issued by Maritime Services Board, Council will need to liaise with the Waterways Authority of NSW to have this matter enforced.

---

**Councillor Dawson asking:**

Mr Sam Zweig has written a feisty letter about Double Bay street works. Has the Mayor replied and secondly what is the state of the Double Bay streets?

**Mayor In response:**

If you had read the Councillors Briefing Notes last Friday you will see that they have done a survey of it and that works are being undertaken to remove the ripples and ripples.

**Manager of Civil Works & Infrastructure further in response:**

Works to restore the path in Bay Street have commenced. The responsibility of maintaining temporary restorations is the responsibility of the utility service provider until such time we provide a permanent repair of the area. We have inspected the temporary restorations in Double Bay with representatives from Enerserve (Energy Australia's contractor). We raised our concerns regarding the state of the temporary restoration provided, identified where corrective repairs were necessary, and have requested Enerserve to repair these areas immediately. If Enerserve fails to undertake the repairs to our requirements we will arrange for the repairs to be completed and pass on our costs to Energy Australia.

---

**Councillor Excell asking:**

Last week you were written to by a Mr Albert Frey regarding the spraying of Round Up in Rose Bay Park, below the Rose Bay Police Station. He was very concerned that there was no signage warning the people utilising the park that there was chemicals being sprayed. He was also concerned that they were close to a playground and he was also concerned that we use Round Up when other Councils have stopped using it due to a controversy over its safety. He has not had a response to this questions and was wondering when he would receive one.

**Manager Parks & Street Trees in response:**

Mr Frey was spoken to on site by a senior staff member and has subsequently been sent a letter outlining Council's procedure for spot spraying Round Up and Council's adopted Pesticide Use Notification Plan.

**Councillor Excell asking:**

Last week in the Wentworth Courier there was an article regarding the closure of a laneway between Glenmore Road and Cooper Street that had been open since 1884. The residents are upset about this. What is happening with that?

**Director Technical Services in response:**

That matter is being investigated. The access way, I understand, is over private land and a number of properties facing Glenmore Road with rear access to Cooper Street may have had rights to that access but there is not a public right of access as far as we can ascertain at this stage. However I believe it has been reopened.

**Mayor in further response:**

I can also indicate that contrary to the report in the Wentworth Courier, Council had nothing to do with it. What has happened, as I understand, the owners of the land wrote to a number of people telling them that they can't use it and the other ones said yes you can use it and I will give you a key to the gate, and as Mr Hatton indicated it is open at the moment. It is a private matter and is being investigated.

---

**Councillor Shoebridge asking:**

Can any steps be taken by Council to move the pre-polling office from its proposed location at the far western side of the Municipality (90 New South Head Road) which is:

- a) on the first floor and not accessible from the street,
- b) at the bottom of a steep hill and inaccessible for disabled or elderly residents or residents with young children,
- c) has no parking available at all,
- d) is behind a security door,
- e) does not facilitate pre-poll voting,
- f) not located centrally or in a major retail centre.

**General Manager in response:**

I agree with the assessment as to the suitability of the site but it is not for us to determine where the accommodation should be for the Returning Officer. Certainly we can ask the Electoral Commission that question as to whether they would be prepared to move. I would think that would be difficult at this late stage given the advertising, the notifications that have probably taken place and the other problem may be, without me knowing, what other accommodation would be available and is suitable for them for the period they require it. I am more than happy to ask them.

**Manager Governance further in response:**

A detailed report on the actions taken following the last Council Meeting to find a more suitable location has been distributed separately to Councillors.

**Councillor Shoebridge asking:**

Is it true that Council has to pay \$23,000 in rent for this inappropriate pre-polling site?

**General Manager in response:**

\$23,000 is the estimate that was provided to us some time ago, as part of the \$248,000. There will be, at the end of this, detailed costing so that we actually get a more accurate bill but certainly \$23,000 is the figure that is provided in the estimate at this stage.

---

**Councillor Shoebridge asking:**

Can you please provide an update on the current state of negotiations and/or proposals to develop Council's Kiaora lands and any adjoining land?

**General Manager in response:**

The Mayor and I had some discussion about this a couple of days ago and we have agreed that we will put a status/update report to the Corporate and Works Committee on a confidential basis. We will bring all Councillors up to date in relation to those negotiations.

---

**Councillor Shoebridge asking:**

Can you please provide what information can be provided on the public record for the residents?

**General Manager in response:**

Yes, I will provide whatever information I can.

---

**Councillor Excell asking:**

Can we as a Council write to the Electoral Commissioner, and if they won't move it, say we found it a very unsuitable location and could they please place it in a more suitable location.

**General Manager in response:**

We can write on those terms but I do indicate that is difficult and has been in previous years for the Electoral Commission to find suitable accommodation.

---

**Councillor Petrie asking:**

Can you update this Council on the reported “Calling in” of Assingtons development of the “Ritz Carlton/Sir Stamford” by the State Government even before this Council has had an opportunity to consider the matter?

**Director Planning and Development in response:**

On 24 July 2008 we received a letter from the Department of Planning asking the Council to provide assessment criteria for a project which involves the redevelopment of the Stamford Plaza Hotel. That letter had been sent to us prior to any advice that the project was to be declared a part 3A project under the State Projects SEPP 2005. On 24 July, the same day, I sent back a lengthy e-mail to the Department of Planning raising a number of serious concerns about this letter, namely that they were asking the Council to provide assessment criteria for a project which at that time I was under the understating had not been formally declared as a part 3A project. In my reply I raised a number of concerns about the correspondence and referred to guidelines which had been published by the Department of Planning as to the proper process that was to be followed in the Minister’s determination of a project as a state significant project. That correspondence concluded with a view that the project should not be declared a state significant project for a number of reasons.

I received a verbal reply to that correspondence this afternoon from a senior officer of the Department of Planning. That senior officer indicated that the project has been declared a state significant project on the basis that it falls in one of the categories specified in schedule 1 to the state policy. We still have not received any advice in writing that the project has been declared a state significant project under the SEPP and it seems to me that the way the Act is written it is not an automatic declaration that the project be a part 3A project because it requires the Minister to form an opinion that the project is of state and regional significance. I am yet to see the documentation from the Department and I will be speaking to them again tomorrow in relation to their declaration that the project is a state significant project.

---

**Councillor Petrie asking:**

When you met with Mr Kirk and Mr Wiley last week from the Paddington Bowling Club, did they indicate, in light of the hearing of the Paddington Bowling Club, whether they are still seeking to purchase the crown land?

**Mayor in response:**

I can indicate yes I did meet with Andrew Wiley and Brian Kirk last Friday. The intention was for them to tell me that they had a clean bill of health arising from the enquiry that was held under the Registered Clubs Act. The Administrator is of the view that there is a binding deed of arrangement requesting the Government to sell the land to the Bowling Club who will then on sell it to those parties to the deed of arrangement. The application has not gone in yet but I understand will be entering into it shortly. I can indicate that I asked them for the membership numbers, as I understood the report they had 40 playing members as of 1999, they said now there is 100. They also told me that they have a number of social members, which is a curious system they have, it is you pay \$2 you become a social member so that at the end of the financial year there might be 4,000-5,000 social members depending on how many people have walked through the door and paid their \$2. Come the first of July they have no social members and they wait until the next 30 June for their social membership. I can indicate I will be writing to the Minister with certain observations about the proposed sale. I should indicate that they are also still trying to purchase the roadway which is the roadway from the Quarry Street Depot through to the Palms Tennis Court area and the community garden area and our nursery on the basis that at the moment they have no road access to a public road which is a precursor before they can buy the land.

---

**Councillor Shoebridge asking:**

Can you provide an estimate as to the dollar value of any section 94 (or 94A) contributions seized by the State Government in calling in the Assingtons development and/or any Section 94 (or 94A) contributions lost to the Woollahra community as a result of it being declared state significant?

**Director Planning and Development in response:**

On notice

---

Gary James  
General Manager

---

**Annexures:**

Nil