



4th May, 2004

WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RANDWICK WILL BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, 90 AVOCA STREET, RANDWICK, ON TUESDAY, 11TH MAY, 2004 AT 6:00 P.M.

Committee Members: His Worship the Mayor, Cr M. Matson, Crs Belleli, Hughes (Deputy Chairperson), Notley-Smith (Chairperson), Seng, Sullivan, Tracey & White.

Quorum: Five (5) members.

NOTE: AT THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD ON 5TH SEPTEMBER, 2000, THE COUNCIL RESOLVED THAT THE WORKS COMMITTEE BE CONSTITUTED AS A COMMITTEE WITH FULL DELEGATION TO DETERMINE MATTERS ON THE AGENDA.

1 Apologies

2 Minutes

CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 10TH FEBRUARY, 2004.

3 Addresses to Committee by the Public

4 Mayoral Minutes

5 Works

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 5.1 | DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 16/2004 - 'HILLII FICUS' OUTSIDE 160 EASTERN AVENUE, KINGSFORD. | 2 |
| 5.2 | DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 17/2004 - COUNCIL STREET TREE GROWING OUTSIDE 118 ALMA ROAD, MAROUBRA. | 4 |
| 5.3 | DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 18/2004 – RESIDENTS PERMIT PARKING – THE SPOT. | 6 |

5.4	DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 19/2004 - 'FICUS HILLII' OUTSIDE NO 2 TEDWIN AVENUE, KENSINGTON.	8
5.5	DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 20/2004 - ROSS JONES MEMORIAL POOL, COOGEE.	10
5.6	DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 21/2004 - SHIRLEY CRESCENT, MATRAVILLE - VARIOUS ROAD RESERVE REQUESTS.	17
5.7	DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES' REPORT 22/2004 - 13 DARLEY ROAD, RANDWICK - PLATANUS x HYBRIDA GROWING WITHIN REAR OF PROPERTY APPLICATION.	21
6	General Business	
7	Notice of Rescission Motions	

.....
GENERAL MANAGER

Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 16/2004



SUBJECT:	FICUS 'HILLII' OUTSIDE 160 EASTERN AVENUE, KINGSFORD
-----------------	--

DATE:	20 April, 2004	FILE NO:	P/010191
--------------	----------------	-----------------	----------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

The owner of 160 Eastern Avenue, Kingsford, Mr George Arfaras, has written to Council on several occasions highlighting the ongoing problems he has experienced with tree roots from a Council-owned Ficus 'Hillii' growing on the nature strip outside his property.

These problems have been occurring for a number of years and range from constant and ongoing sewerage blockages to structural damage to the residence itself.

ISSUES:

Mr Arfaras asserts that the sewer problem goes back to at least 1981 and that blockages have been occurring regularly ever since. STOWE records indicate that since mid-1997 Council's plumber has been called to the property on more than 20 occasions to clear blocked pipes.

As well as this particular problem, the roots of this tree have caused structural damage to the residence itself that Council paid to have repaired.

An entire section of damaged sewer pipe in the neighbouring property (162 Eastern Avenue) was replaced by Council some years ago as a result of tree root damage caused by this tree.

Large sections of the footpath area adjacent to where the tree is growing have also had to be replaced on several occasions.

The tree concerned is in excellent health and is the largest street tree growing along the southern end of Eastern Avenue. It is one of only two large trees of this species growing this section of the street and is therefore significant in size if not somewhat incongruous in the streetscape.

The tree is approximately 20 metres in height and around the same dimension across the canopy.

As stated, its roots are currently causing serious damage to the adjacent footpath and it is dropping copious amounts of fruit on the footpath and nature strip. Both these problems constitute a very real liability issue for Council – although the footpath can be repaired (only a temporary measure) and the fruiting issue is seasonal.

CONCLUSION:

Mr Arfaras has for some time requested that this tree be removed and replaced with a more appropriate tree species and I concur with this proposal.

The removal and replacement of this tree would certainly fall within the parameters set out in Council's recently adopted resolution relating to aggressive-rooted street trees.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council-owned *Ficus microcarpa* var. 'Hillii' (Hill's Weeping fig) growing on the nature strip outside 160 Eastern Avenue, Kingsford, be removed and replaced with an advanced *Syzygium luehmannii* (Lilly Pilly) – as per Council's Street Tree Masterplan.

ATTACHMENT/S:

Nil

.....
MICK SAVAGE
DIRECTOR ASSET &
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....
BRYAN BOURKE
TREE MANAGEMENT OFFICER



Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 17/2004

SUBJECT:	COUNCIL STREET TREE GROWING OUTSIDE 118 ALMA ROAD, MAROUBRA.
-----------------	--

DATE:	24 March, 2004	FILE NO:	R/0024/03
--------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

The owner of 118 Alma Road, Maroubra, Mr John Agapitos, has requested that Council remove the *Harpephyllum caffrum* (Kaffir Plum) growing in the nature strip outside the above property.

The tree is in good health and is part of a predominantly single-species planting scheme running along both sides of the street.

ISSUES:

The roots of this tree are causing structural damage to Mr Agapitos' front brick fence and there is cracking evident in two areas.

The canopy is growing into overhead wires and overhangs into the property to a relatively large degree. It also overhangs onto the driveway and it is alleged that fruit and sap cause staining to the paint of cars parked in the driveway.

During seasonal fruiting the tree is filled with fruit bats and they produce excessive amounts of excreta and this concerns Mr Agapitos and his family.

Several residents from neighbouring properties have written to Council objecting to any proposal to remove the subject tree and their petition is attached to the street tree file for Alma Road.

These residents consider that the tree is entirely appropriate as a street tree and that it contributes significantly to the amenity of the area. However, the trees are not fifty years old (as stated) and a visual inspection would reveal that there is cracking to the front brick fence of the property.

The fact that there are numbers of this species planted along this section of Alma Road has little or no relevance as to whether they are an appropriate street tree species.

CONCLUSION:

This is one of the four species approved by Council in November, 2002, for progressive removal and replacement with more appropriate tree species.

Roots from this particular specimen are growing under the front brick fence and are cracking the fence. Root pruning is only ever going to be a temporary solution to an ongoing problem.

The tree is one of a number of the same species growing along this section of Alma Road and it forms part of a streetscape with considerable visual amenity.

The owner of the property has expressed a desire to have this tree removed and replaced with a more appropriate species – as per Council’s Street Tree Masterplan.

A Work Order is to be initiated instructing tree planting contractors to plant out both sides of Alma Road, wherever space allows, with *Gleditsia triacanthos* ‘Sunburst’ – a fast growing species that will attain a height of approximately five-six metres with a canopy spread of around four-five metres.

RECOMMENDATION:

That approval be granted to remove the Council-owned *Harpephyllum caffrum* (Kaffir Plum) growing on the nature strip outside 118 Alma Road, Maroubra, and that a more appropriate native tree species be planted as a replacement.

ATTACHMENT/S:

Nil

.....
MICK SAVAGE
DIRECTOR ASSET &
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....
BRYAN BOURKE
TREE MANAGEMENT OFFICER

Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 18/2004



SUBJECT:	RESIDENTS PERMIT PARKING - THE SPOT
-----------------	-------------------------------------

DATE:	22 April, 2004	FILE NO:	98/S/2714
--------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

The attached report entitled “On-Street Parking – The Spot” is the first of eleven planned precinct parking reports dealing with residents parking within the City. This report deals specifically with the Spot precinct.

ISSUES:

Council is in the process of reviewing all existing residents parking schemes within the City with the view to implementing area-based residents parking schemes.

It is the purpose of this review to re-assess the demand for residents parking and to introduce, where appropriate, area-wide permit schemes in lieu of street-based schemes. It is also the purpose of this review to invoke best principles for the on-going management of residents parking schemes, including such matters as the span of hours, the period(s) of restrictions, parking opportunity and efficiency, and parking enforcement.

CONCLUSION:

The attached report extensively details the results and findings of a study conducted by Council in the Spot precinct between August 2003 and February 2004, and provides an in-depth analysis of the on-street parking situation within this precinct. It is considered that the proposed measures and actions as detailed in Section B of this report are well founded and should be adopted.

It is proposed that the recommendations of this report be adopted by Council in principle. Subsequently, it is proposed that this report be submitted to the Randwick Traffic Committee for concurrence and then be placed on public display before final approval by Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

That

1. The recommendations of The Spot On-Street Parking Report be adopted in principle,
2. The proposal be referred to the Randwick Traffic Committee for concurrence,
3. The proposal be placed on public display.

ATTACHMENT/S:

1. Report On-Street Parking - The Spot (BOTH UNDER SEPARATE COVER)
2. CONFIDENTIAL Survey Data.

.....
MICK SAVAGE
DIRECTOR ASSET &
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....
ALAN OPERA
TRAFFIC ENGINEER



Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 19/2004

SUBJECT:	'FICUS HILLII' OUTSIDE NO 2 TEDWIN AVENUE, KENSINGTON
-----------------	--

DATE:	20 April, 2004	FILE NO:	98/S/0019
--------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

The owner of 2 Tedwin Avenue, Kensington, Mr Dennis Cooney, has written to Council on several occasions highlighting the ongoing problems he has experienced with tree roots from a Council-owned Ficus 'Hillii' growing on the nature strip outside his property.

These problems have been occurring for a number of years and range from constant and ongoing sewerage blockages to structural damage inside the property itself.

ISSUES:

Mr Cooney asserts that sewer problems caused by the roots of this tree go back at least a decade and that blockages are still occurring regularly. As well as this particular problem, the roots of this tree have caused structural damage inside the property that Council has had to pay to have repaired.

Large sections of the footpath area and driveway adjacent to where the tree is growing have also had to be replaced on several occasions.

The subject tree is approximately 10-12 metres in height and around the same dimension across the canopy.

As stated, its roots are causing ongoing damage to the adjacent footpath and it is alleged that they are continuing to cause damage inside the property.

CONCLUSION:

Mr and Mrs Cooney have for some time requested that this tree be removed and replaced with a more appropriate tree species and I concur with this proposal.

The removal and replacement of this tree would certainly fall within the parameters set out in Council's recently adopted resolution relating to aggressive-rooted street trees.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council-owned Ficus microcarpa var. 'Hillii' (Hill's Weeping fig) growing on the nature strip outside 2 Tedwin Avenue, Kensington, be removed and replaced with an advanced Syzygium luehmannii (Lilly Pilly) – as per Council's Street Tree Masterplan.

ATTACHMENT/S:

Nil

.....
MICK SAVAGE
DIRECTOR ASSET &
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....
BRYAN BOURKE
TREE MANAGEMENT OFFICER



Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 20/2004

SUBJECT:	ROSS JONES MEMORIAL POOL, COOGEE
-----------------	----------------------------------

DATE:	27 April, 2004	FILE NO:	PROJ/0033
--------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

At the Works Committee meeting held on the 14 October 2003, Council resolved that:

- a) *The pylons on the northern end of the pool be deleted, however no other pylons should be deleted from the scope of works due to the Heritage Significance, Liability Issues, Aesthetic Character and issues listed in the Coogee Foreshore Plan of Management;*
- b) *The chains should be deleted from the scope of works;*
- c) *The proposed 80mm concrete render thickness of all the internal pool walls should remain as per specification due to additional costs involved and the fact that the pool is not of standard competition dimensions;*
- d) *A Pool Audit be carried out on this pool (Ross Jones Memorial Pool) by the Royal Surf Life Saving Society, Australia, to ensure that the refurbished pool will comply with the requirements of Council's insurers; and*
- e) *Council officers arrange to have the specification altered as required above and to meet the requirements of Council's insurers and then proceed to liaise with the Lands Department to get consent to lodge the D.A. for the project with a view to carrying out the repair works in the 2004 off season.*

The requirements of (clause d) of the Council resolution was carried out first to ensure the proposed repair works will comply with the requirements of Council's insurers.

HISTORY

A Heritage Assessment and Conservation Guidelines for the proposed repair works were carried out by Colin Brady Architecture + Planning in June 2003. The purpose of this Assessment was to identify any Heritage Issues related to the proposed repair work to the pool. The Assessment concluded that the pool is of high local significance by virtue of its aesthetic form and scale, its relationship to the surroundings landscape and its iconic status within the Sydney community. The assessment recommends that the essential fabric and setting of the pool be maintained, that any demolition, alteration or repair to the

existing fabric should have regard for culturally significant features of the site and that the majority of existing fabric should be retained in maintenance of the pool.

As part of the community consultation for the repairs of Ross Jones Memorial Pool, Council officers prepared an information panel for exhibition, which was located at the Coogee Surf Life Saving Club over the weekend of the AGM for the Club (26 July 2003). The following were the main points raised by the Coogee Huskies and the Coogee Surf Life Saving Club in regards to the proposed works.

1. Request for the deletion of some of the pylons (in particular the three pylons at the northern end of the main pool). This request comes as some of the pool users dive into the water during competition races.
2. Request for the deletion of the chain links between the pylons. They expressed concern as people could get caught up in the chains if a surge or wave forces them into or out of the pool, leading to injuries. Also by providing the opportunity for people to use them to hang on in big surf conditions.
3. Concern was also expressed in regards to the thickness of the proposed repairs to the internal concrete wall render, which will decrease the internal dimensions of the pool by 160mm.

There were several issues that Council Officers had to address in considering the results of the consultation. These included; public liability, heritage implications, *The Coogee Beach and Foreshore Plan of Management* and the overall additional costs which would result if the requests from the community consultation are fully or partially implemented.

ISSUES RAISED:

These issues were included in the first report considered by Council at its meeting of 14 October 2003 as follows:

1. Public Liability Issues

The following points were raised by the Manager of Purchasing and Contracts and the Risk Coordinator, at a meeting held on 22 August 2003 in relation to the requests from the Coogee Huskies Winter Swimming Club Inc. and the Coogee Surf Life Saving Club.

- There will be a liability concern if Council is to accommodate the needs of a specific group of users when Ross Jones Memorial Pool is a public pool. All public safety issues have to be considered for the wider community.
- The removal of the 3 pylons would encourage people to dive into a tidal pool when the pool depths are variable. There are also concerns in regards to the algae growth along the areas between the pylons. Council is not able to remove this growth as often as it would be required for people to be walking over it.
- Appropriate safety sign(s) are to be installed in the immediate pool area to discourage the practice of diving. There is currently some signage on site but this is faded and out of date.
- The new sign should be a regulation sign, which will also need to cover other aspects of safety regulations in regards to the usage of the pool.
- The Risk Coordinator stated that in regards to the safety issues of the pool, before any repair works commences, a Safety Audit should be conducted by the Royal Life Saving Society Australia. The pool needs to comply with all pool safety

regulations, standards and legislations in the near future in order for Council's Insurance Underwriters to cover Council's Public Liability Insurance.

2. Heritage Significance

Mr. Colin Brady (Heritage Consultant) has prepared a Heritage Assessment and Conservation Guidelines for the repairs of Ross Jones Memorial Pool. He has submitted the following information in regards to the requests from the community consultation:

- *"The recommendation for the safety chain not to be reinstated, is based upon concern that children will use the chain as restraint when heavy seas enter the pool. It is feared that such activity will lead to injury. As the chain installation is a new detail reflective of the previous installation both its installation and deletion will have limited impact upon the heritage significance of the pool"* It is assumed this means that the chain has no heritage value but the heritage consultant regards it as improving the safety aspect of this facility.
- In relation to the removal of the three pylons, *"these are an original feature of considerable significance to the pool. The removal of the piers would clearly facilitate movement along the top of the pool wall but would require additional safety barriers to the outer edge. This would require a set of post supports for the proposed chain or similar forms of restraint. This is not a recommended alteration to the pool and would be favoured only where no alternate solution is available"*.

3. Coogee Beach and Foreshore Plan of Management (Nov 1997)

Consideration should also be given to the Plan of Management, which states on page 35: *'This pool was built in 1947. According to the National Trust, the pool is significant because: it has a unique design, which includes concrete piers, which extend beyond the top of the walls resembling crenellations on a sand castle; it has aesthetic appeal due to its siting and relationship to the surrounding elements.....'*

Note should also be taken to page 56, which states:

'The pool has no safety fence although it is assumed that chains would normally be placed between the concrete uprights. These uprights are reminiscent of crenellations likely to be found on a child's sandcastle, giving the pool a unique appearance'

In the 'Recommendations Schedule' for Ross Jones Memorial Pool on page 57 of The Plan of Management, it indicates that the damaged piers need to be repaired and that the chain to the pool perimeter is to be reinstated.

Other Implications:

1. Other repair works that have been identified as part of the site investigations with Council's Risk Coordinator and through the heritage consultant are the repairs to the toddler's pool, repairs to steps from the Surf Club to the pool and the repairs to the steps in the pool.
2. Additional costs would be involved if the thickness of the pool wall concrete render cannot be increased by 160mm. This would mean that the existing concrete walls would need to have to 80mm removed from the inside surface of the pool to ensure that the same internal dimensions continued. Additional costs would be in the demolition and the extra concrete render. As the pool is not a standard competition length, these additional costs are considered extravagant.

SWIMMING POOL SAFETY ASSESSMENT AND SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

As required by Clause (d) of Council's resolution Council officers engaged the Royal Life Surf Saving Society to carry out a Swimming Pool Safety Assessment and Safety Improvement Plan. The Safety Assessment was conducted on 3 November 2003 and the report was finalized on 18 December 2003.

The Royal Life Saving Society Australia (RLSSA) was given a concept plan with the proposed changes outlined in Council's resolution of 14 October 2003:

ISSUES:

Issues raised by the Royal Life Saving Society Australia (RLSSA) include the following:

Signage

- It is recommended that there be signage in place to warn users that the pool is not directly supervised.
- The signage in place should be better maintained and should conform to Australian Standards.
- There should be extra signage indicating slippery surfaces, no diving and the depths of the pool.

Diving

- Due to the pool's depth, there should be no diving allowed and signage should be displayed to reinforce this (for recreational swimmers).
- For competitive swimmers, RLSSA recommends through their Guidelines for safe Pool Operation that no diving is undertaken at depths less than 900mm (0.9m). In water depths 900mm to 1000mm competitive dive starts may be permitted from concourse level to a maximum height of 200mm. Whilst this is taking place additional signage should be in place.
- As the pool was at a depth of 0.9m during assessment the pool fits into the second category. But as it is a tidal pool depths can change. It needs to be a minimum of 0.9m to use a dive entry.
- This activity should also be assessed against the swim clubs insurance policy.

Pylons

- All pylons should be of the same height. It is not recommended to leave one side of the pool pylon free as this will allow others to dive which is another risk that is not wanted.
- The chain linking the pylons is a good idea.
- In terms of the width of the platform to dive, RLSSA does not have any recommendations on that one, you may need to contact NSW Swimming.

Others

- All handrails should conform with Australia Standards.
- Appropriate emergency procedures should also be in place.
- Hand rails should be installed at the entry point (report)
- The algae and moss build up should be monitored and cleaned regularly.

On 19 February 2004, Randwick City Council requested the RLSSA to investigate proposed renovations to the Ross Jones Memorial Pool, with particular reference to pedestrian access along the North retaining wall and dive entries into the pool. The site visit / meeting was attended by the RLSSA, Coogee Huskies, the Coogee Surf Life Saving Club, State-wide Insurances and Randwick City Council. The Report submitted to Council gave Council two options in response to the requests and discussions from the above mentioned attendees.

Option one – This option refers to only having the proposed repair works done, having no changes made to the curtilage of the pool. By leaving the pool as it is, it is unlikely that this will increase Council's liability or affect current insurance arrangements, as the situation would remain unaltered from the present. The main issues raised were:

- Leave structure as it is currently
- Repair pylons
- Repair retaining walls
- Retain No Diving prohibition
- Maintain slip resistance of entry steps

Option two – This option refers to Changes to the Pool Infrastructure at the pool and the report gives Council two potential options for improvements.

A – Repair walls and remove pylons (on northern wall only) – Not Recommended by the RLSSA. This was the proposal presented at the meeting from members representing the Huskies to dive into the pool during competitions. The Report concludes that this option is not recommended for the following reasons:

- Current wall is only 600mm wide which is not wide enough to allow for two people to pass each other.
- Current wall is very slippery.
- The removal of the pylons will invite the public to walk on top of the retaining wall.

B – Remove Pylons and Enhance Northern Wall. If Council decides to go ahead with the removal of the pylons on the northern wall then the Report recommends the following minimum changes be made:

- Remove bollards from northern wall to allow free access
- Widen top of retaining wall to allow for the passing of two people – min 1200 wide, preferably two metres
- Construct new concourse so that the surface is slip resistant
- Allow diving by specific user groups – (Please note that Council's Risk Coordinator has indicated that this would create major liability issues to Council and cannot be policed)

Once all the above information was gathered Council's Heritage Planner was requested to assess all the information from a heritage aspect. The report has raised the following points:

- The pool is listed as a heritage item under Randwick Local Environmental Plan 1998.

- Both the Coogee Beach Foreshore Plan of Management and the National Trust note that the pool has a unique design which includes concrete piers which extend beyond the top of the walls resembling crenellations on a sand castle.
- The removal of pylons and enhancement of the wall would only facilitate use of the pool by some community groups.
- There are concerns that removal of the bollards/pylons would detract from the unique design of the pool.
- There are concerns that the doubling or trebling of the width of the northern wall could significantly change the form, design and setting of the pool, including its physical and visual relationship with its setting. As a result of widening the wall the area of the children's pool will decrease in size and encroach onto the sand and rock outcrops in this area.

ADDITIONAL COSTS AND REQUIRED FUNDING

Council Officers engaged Patterson Britton & Partners Pty Ltd the engineers who prepared the construction plans for the repair work to Ross Jones Pool to provide a cost estimate on the options set out in the Pool Audit Report. The estimated additional cost is \$68,250.00 which includes the following:

- Removal of pylons from top of existing walls and repair concrete ready to receive antislip coating
- Widen top of pool wall
- Install slip resistant coating to existing rock/concrete
- Maintenance of slip resistance of concrete

Council currently has \$100,000 in the Budget to undertake repairs works.

CONCLUSION:

It is considered that:

1. No pylons should be deleted from the scope of works due to the Heritage Significance, Liability Issues, Aesthetic Character and issues listed in the Coogee Foreshore Plan of Management.
2. Signage should be upgraded due to the Liability Issues and Safety for the general community.
3. Appropriate emergency procedures be in place during peak times of pool usage. As the peak usage coincides with the peak beach usage, Council's lifeguards and the Coogee Surf Life Saving Club would normally be on duty at these times.
4. A regular maintenance program to be put implemented to ensure all algae and moss build up be monitored and cleaned regularly.
5. Handrails be installed at the entry steps to the pool.

These issues need to be determined so that the specifications can be suitably altered prior to getting the Lands Department's consent to submit a Development Application for the project.

RECOMMENDATION:

That:

1. No pylons be deleted from the scope of works due to the Heritage Significance, Liability Issues, Aesthetic Character and issues listed in the Coogee Foreshore Plan of Management.
2. Signage be upgraded due to the Liability Issues and Safety for the general community.
3. Appropriate emergency procedures be put in place during peak times of pool usage.
4. A regular maintenance program be implemented to ensure all algae and moss build up is monitored and cleaned regularly.
5. Handrails be installed at the entry steps to the pool.

ATTACHMENT/S:

Heritage Assessment & Conservation Guidelines

Construction Drawings

Report from Council's Heritage Planner

Royal Life Saving Pool Audit Reports (ALL UNDER SEPARATE COVER)

.....
MICK SAVAGE
DIRECTOR ASSET &
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....
DIMITRI MANTHOPOULOS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT



Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 21/2004

SUBJECT:	SHIRLEY CRESCENT, MATRAVILLE - VARIOUS ROAD RESERVE REQUESTS
-----------------	--

DATE:	22 April, 2004	FILE NO:	R/0676/01
--------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

In a petition that represents residents of Shirley Crescent, Matraville, the following requests were forwarded to Council for consideration:

- Construction of footpath on both sides of Shirley Crescent and Shirley Lane;
- Repair and resurface Shirley Crescent and Shirley Lane;
- Where necessary, plant new grass in the existing nature strips; and
- Council water the nature strip once a week using bore water.

ISSUES:

Footpath Construction Request

A meeting of Council on 17 September 2002 resolved that a 5-year footpath construction programme was to commence beginning 2003/04 for the construction of footpath along one side of all streets in South and Central Wards.

Consequently footpath was constructed on the east side of Shirley Crescent. It should be noted that the intention of the footpath program is to provide a paved, trafficable footpath in the majority of streets throughout the City of Randwick. All residents would then have access to a paved footpath, the worst scenario being that they would have to walk across the road to reach this path.

Lanes are not wide enough to accommodate a formalised footpath as well as two-way traffic, given the narrow width of the road verge on either side of the roadway and as such Shirley Lane was not listed for inclusion in the five-year footpath programme.

Road Repair and Resurfacing Request

Council's Asset Engineer has inspected both Shirley Crescent and Shirley Lane, and confirms the deteriorating condition of the road pavement although there are no serious potholes requiring maintenance at this time.

Council operates an accredited Pavement Maintenance Management System (PMS), which assists in optimising and prioritising expenditure on Council's roads to provide the greatest level of benefit to the entire community. Utilisation of the PMS considers the importance of the time for intervention for rehabilitation of roads, which is paramount. Deferred intervention can result in the need for reconstruction works costing up to four times that of rehabilitation works.

Consequently, rehabilitation works are generally prioritised for roads experiencing higher community usage, particularly heavy vehicles, to avoid reconstruction and minimise future costs.

Shirley Crescent and Shirley Lane generally experience low levels of heavy vehicles, and consequently, do not constitute a high priority for resurfacing/rehabilitation works.

However, they will be checked with segments prioritised by the PMS for the 2004-2005 resurfacing/rehabilitation programme, to be developed in May/June, to ensure the accuracy of PMS decisions.

Until such time as the road is resurfaced the residents should be advised to report future potholes to Council's Call Centre.

Nature Strip Replanting Request

Residents have requested that nature strips be returned, where necessary. Council's maintenance budget does not allow for the re-turfing of nature strips other than those in front of Council owned properties. Residents are encouraged to look after their nature strips as a means of improving the look of the street in which they live and this has been relatively successful in the majority of cases throughout the City area.

Council will only perform maintenance or capital improvements on nature strips when a given area poses a significant level of public risk. Should residents wish to have their nature strips returned from a purely aesthetic viewpoint, Council officers will provide quotations for the above in line with the Prepaid Works policy and the resident must bear the full cost for the project (including the Application fee).

Recent inspections have revealed that nature strips along Shirley Crescent do not pose any significant public risk, as ground levels contain minimal grade and as such no returning works on the nature strips are considered warranted at this time...

Watering of Nature Strip with bore water Request

As previously indicated in this report, Council encourages residents to care for their nature strips as Council's maintenance budget cannot sustain this activity. Residents should note that any watering of nature strips should be in keeping with the current mandatory water restriction requirements enforced by Sydney Water.

CONCLUSION:

Consequent to Council resources being directed towards providing a footpath on one side of every street and given that footpath has already been constructed on one side of Shirley Crescent as part of the 5 year footpath programme, footpath requests for the west side of Shirley Crescent and on both sides of Shirley Lane will not be considered for inclusion in the current 5 year footpath construction programme.

Council officers recommend streets to be resurfaced in line with the scientifically determined priorities of the Pavement Maintenance Management System (PMS) and these streets will be considered for resurfacing as part of the 2004/2005 road resurfacing programme on line with the above process. Council officers do a merit assessment of lanes on the basis of level of access provided by these lanes and their condition prior to determining whether these segments of roadway are resurfaced.

In relation to the nature-strips, Council's budget does not allow for purely aesthetic maintenance although any situations creating a potential public risk, are dealt with in an urgent manner by Council's maintenance workforce.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the petitioners be advised :

1. Council will not provide a footpath on both sides of any ordinary residential streets in the City of Randwick until every street in the City has a paved footpath constructed on at least one of its sides.
2. Road resurfacing on Shirley Crescent be included for consideration in 2004-2005 roads resurfacing programme and assessed by the Pavement Maintenance Management System and Shirley lane be subjected to a merit assessment by Council's Road Assets Engineer to determine whether or not whether it should be resurfaced.
3. Any potholes in the street should be reported to Council's Call Centre to enable the appropriate action to be taken;
4. Council does not carry out maintenance (including mowing or watering) of turfed footpath areas unless there is a danger to the public.

ATTACHMENT/S:

Petition from Residents

.....
 MICK SAVAGE
 DIRECTOR ASSET &
 INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....
 FRANK ROTTA
 DESIGN MANAGER

9 February, 2004

Mr. Dominic Sullivan,
and all Councillors:
Randwick City Council
Administration Centre
30 Frances Street,
RANDWICK NSW 2031

Randwick City Council

RCC CORPORATE INFORMATION
 Location: J. Cadogan, Randwick
 File No. 99/5/1173, R/0676/01
 Action Officer: Mayor - J.M. Cadogan
 Document No. 230884 - 230885
 05 MAR 2004
 Mayor's Office Received

Dear Gentlemen,

Please kindly acknowledge the receipt of our petition regarding the following matter and reply to us as soon as possible.

Subject: Request 1. Footpath - Construction of footpath on both sides of Shirley Crescent and Shirley Lane.

Subject: Request 2. Road - To repair and resurface the whole of Shirley Crescent and also Shirley Lane. At the present moment road has many pot holes. So please kindly fix it.

Subject: Request 3. Nature Strip - Wherever necessary, new grass to be planted because the existing nature strip is full of weeds and dead grass.

Subject: Request 4. Water H2O - Water restrictions are in full force in Sydney. So we therefore suggest that the Council should water the nature strip once a week using bore water.

We, the under-signed residents and rate-payers to the Randwick City Council, hereby request the Council to carry out the above work as soon as possible. Failure by the Council to comply to the above requests will result in this petition being submitted to the Consumer Council of NSW, and also to the NSW State Government.

We trust that the above matter will need your utmost attention.

NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
------	---------	-----------

1. Petition File
2 DAIS ✓

Mayor's Office Received
Dated 8-3-04

Director Asset & Infrastructure Services' Report 22/2004



SUBJECT:	13 DARLEY ROAD, RANDWICK - PLATANUS x HYBRIDA GROWING WITHIN REAR OF PROPERTY APPLICATION
-----------------	---

DATE:	29 April, 2004	FILE NO:	P/014954
--------------	----------------	-----------------	----------

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR ASSET & INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

INTRODUCTION:

On 16 March, 2004, the owners of 13 Darley Road, Randwick, Lori and Matthew Doherty, made application to Council under the provisions of its Tree Preservation Order (TPO) for consent to remove a large Platanus x hybrida (London Plane) growing within the rear of that property.

Accompanying this was an application made under the provisions of the same Order by the owner of 11 Darley Road, Randwick, Mihail Orfanos, for permission to prune a Liquidambar styraciflua (Liquidambar) growing within the front of the Doherty property and supporting the removal of the Plane tree in the rear of 13 Darley Road, Randwick.

ISSUES:

There are three large trees growing within 13 Darley Road, Randwick, which are covered by Council's Tree Preservation Order. There is a Platanus x hybrida and a Liquidambar styraciflua growing within a relatively confined front yard area and a very large Platanus x hybrida growing within the middle of the rear of the property.

The reasons given for wanting the Plane tree in the rear of the property removed are that the tree is growing in an inappropriate location, that branches are overhanging the residence, that the tree's size restricts the growth of other plants, that its roots are blocking the neighbour's sewer pipes, that its nutlets trigger allergic reactions during autumn and that its retention causes a significant financial burden.

The subject tree is approximately 25 metres in height with a canopy spread of around 20 metres. It is in excellent health and is extremely significant in the surrounding landscape – it can be seen quite clearly from the front of the property and the surrounding area.

Although not a native species, the tree is an important provider of habitat and shelter for a variety of birdlife.

This particular tree is one of the healthiest and most significant specimens of a *Platanus x hybrida* growing within the entire City of Randwick.

Subsequent to the TPO application being lodged with Council on 16 March, 2004, Council's Tree Preservation and Maintenance Co-ordinator (South) inspected the property on 20 March, 2004, in the company of Mr Doherty.

At that meeting Mr Doherty highlighted the issues above as being the reasons for wanting the tree removed as well as pointing out that he had recently had a DA approved by Council and that the tree would impact on an extension to be built onto the rear of the residence.

In response to these matters, the Council officer advised Mr Doherty that the tree was mature and healthy and causing no significant problems or apparent damage and that she was not prepared to grant consent for it to be removed.

That officer also informed Mr Doherty that he would need to provide evidence of any alleged sewer blockages and that in a situation such as this it was usually the case that any damaged section of pipe should be replaced in PVC plastic – thus allowing the retention of the tree.

Mr Doherty was then advised that because of the size and significance of the subject tree the matter would be referred to Council's Tree Management Officer for review, even though there had been no compelling case presented for its removal.

Council's Tree Management Officer spoke to Mr Doherty on the morning of 31 March, 2004, and arranged to meet him on-site to discuss the TPO application made to Council.

Upon arrival, he briefed Mr Doherty on Council's Tree Preservation Order and its intent – particularly in relation to established, significant vegetation. Mr Doherty responded that he was well aware of Council's TPO but that he considered the Plane tree growing in the rear of his property to be completely inappropriate for the situation in which it was growing.

Mr Doherty pointed out that tree roots were causing ongoing sewer blockages within the rear of the neighbouring property and that this was an unreasonable cost imposition on the elderly gentleman who owned the property.

Council's Tree Management Officer advised him that these sewer blockages were probably the result of an aging and deteriorating sewerage network and that the affected section of pipe could be replaced with PVC plastic rather than removing the subject tree.

Mr Doherty then stated that he was concerned about branches overhanging his residence dropping onto the house and injuring or killing members of his family. He was advised that considering the species of tree and its very good health this was highly unlikely and that approval would readily be granted to prune the branch growing to the north that was growing over the rear of the residence.

He then made the point that surrounding property owners were in agreement with the removal of the tree and that he felt it unreasonable that he should be compelled to retain three 'monumental' trees within his property.

Council's Tree Management Officer then countered this with the fact that Mr Doherty had bought the property with all three trees well and truly established (purchased in March, 2002), that the tree in the rear was in extremely good health, that the majority of issues he raised could be dealt with by either pruning the tree, replacing damaged sewer pipes and that any allergy issues were primarily seasonal.

An inspection of the two trees growing within the front of the property revealed that roots from the Liquidambar were damaging the common boundary fence and Mr Doherty informed the Council officer that they were also damaging the residence next door.

It was at this point that Council's Tree Management Officer informed Mr Doherty that there would certainly be a legitimate case for the removal of the Liquidambar but that there was no such case for the removal of the Plane tree within the rear of the property.

CONCLUSION:

Matthew and Lori Doherty purchased the property at 13 Darley Road, Randwick, in May, 2002, with the two *Platanus x hybrida* (London Plane trees) and one *Liquidambar styraciflua* (Liquidambar) well and truly established. All three trees are in excellent health and are significant in the streetscape.

The Dohertys wish to remove the Plane tree in the rear of the property, even though it is not causing any major problems or causing any sort of major structural damage, but wish to retain the Plane tree and the Liquidambar in the front of the property, even though these two trees are planted in a much more inappropriate situation and the Liquidambar is causing structural damage to the neighbouring property.

There has been a Development Application approved by Council for an extension to be built onto the rear of the existing residence but this will have no impact on the Plane tree growing within the rear of the property.

Any issues that may become apparent during the building of the approved extension could be effectively dealt with by pruning the subject tree.

There has been no documentation provided to Council to support the claim that tree roots are regularly blocking the sewer pipes on the adjoining property and there has been no medical advice forwarded to validate the claim that people are suffering allergic reactions to the tree when it is seeding.

The Plane tree growing within the rear of 13 Darley Road, Randwick, is perhaps the healthiest and most significant example of this tree species growing within the entire City of Randwick.

For a tree of its size it is causing very little root damage of any consequence and it is situated in perhaps the best location possible in relation to the property.

Even taking into account all the issues raised by the Dohertys in their application to Council to have the Plane tree in the rear of their property removed, Council's Tree Management Officer cannot see any compelling nor legitimate reason to approve the application.

RECOMMENDATION:

That:

1. Approval not be granted to remove the large, healthy Platanus x hybrida growing within the rear of 13 Darley Road, Randwick.; and
2. Approval be granted to prune the two Platanus x hybrida and the Liquidambar styraciflua growing within the property as required to abate any nuisance they may be causing.

ATTACHMENT/S:

Nil

.....
MICK SAVAGE
DIRECTOR ASSET &
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

.....
BRYAN BOURKE
TREE MANAGEMENT OFFICER