



Lane Cove
Council

Agenda
Responses to Councillor questions related
to Council Meeting Agenda Items

23 April 2026,

OFFICER MEMOS FOR INFORMATION

1. **INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 11.2 - NOTICE OF MOTION- ENHANCING URBAN BIODIVERSITY THROUGH SCALABLE HABITAT INITIATIVES..... 3**
2. **INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 11.4 - NOTICE OF MOTION - DEVELOPMENT OF A SYNTHETIC TURF IN PUBLIC SPACES POLICY..... 8**
3. **INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 15.2 - PLANNING PROPOSAL 46 - 94 NORTHWOOD ROAD, NORTHWOOD (HERITAGE DE-LISTING)..... 13**
4. **PUBLIC FORUM MEETING - COUNCILLOR INFORMATION SEGMENT 18**

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026**

**INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 11.2 - NOTICE OF MOTION- ENHANCING
URBAN BIODIVERSITY THROUGH SCALABLE HABITAT INITIATIVES**

Item No: INFOR5/26
Subject: Information in relation to Agenda item 11.2 - Notice of Motion- Enhancing Urban Biodiversity through Scalable Habitat Initiatives
Record No: SU7389 - 29404/26
Division: Corporate Services and Strategy Division
Author(s): Lorie Parkinson

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information in response to questions raised by Councillors relating to **Item 11.2 – Notice of Motion – Enhancing Urban Biodiversity through Scalable Habitat Initiatives**.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In accordance with clause 3.35 of the Code of Meeting Practice the following additional information is provided in advance of the Ordinary Council Meeting.

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 11.2 - NOTICE OF MOTION- ENHANCING
URBAN BIODIVERSITY THROUGH SCALABLE HABITAT INITIATIVES**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1

Current Process - Under the current demolition and development approval process, can officers confirm how materials such as clay pipes and timber offcuts are required to be removed and managed, and what health and safety obligations apply, particularly in relation to the identification and handling of asbestos or other contamination?

Response

The NoM seeks Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on how materials can be salvaged in a cost effective and safe manner.

Question 2

Process Gap in the Motion - The Notice of Motion does not appear to outline how materials would be identified and separated for reuse — can officers advise how this would practically occur, and whether demolition contractors would be required to segregate materials into dedicated stockpiles on-site?

Response

The NoM seeks Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on whether and how materials could be segregated.

Question 3

On-site Storage (Two-Pile Issue) - If materials are separated for reuse, would this require on-site storage prior to removal, effectively resulting in multiple stockpiles — one for disposal and one for potential reuse — within a residential property?

Response

The NoM seeks Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on where salvaged materials can be stored and capacity of the nominated storage area.

Question 4

Site Access & Safety - During demolition, when a site is classified as an active construction site with restricted access, how would any secondary inspection or selection of materials for reuse be undertaken in practice, and by whom?

Response

The NoM seeks Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on how materials can be salvaged and reused in a cost effective and safe manner.

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 11.2 - NOTICE OF MOTION- ENHANCING
URBAN BIODIVERSITY THROUGH SCALABLE HABITAT INITIATIVES**

Question 5

Testing & Cost Responsibility - If materials are set aside for reuse, does Council have the expertise to assess them for contamination, including asbestos or sewage exposure, or would this require external specialists, and who would bear that cost?

Response

The NoM seeks Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on contamination management.

Question 6

Contamination After Disturbance - If materials are removed from their original position and stockpiled, and contamination such as asbestos is subsequently detected, how would that risk be safely managed once disturbed, and would this require specialist remediation and removal?"

Response

The NoM seeks Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on contamination management.

Question 7

Time Delays - Would the requirement to separate, store, inspect, and assess materials for reuse extend demolition timeframes, and if contamination is identified, would this further delay completion due to additional safety and regulatory requirements?

Response

The NoM requests Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details of contamination management and safety matters.

Question 8

Environmental Suitability of Materials - The motion refers broadly to artificial refuges — can officers advise whether materials such as PVC would be included, and whether environmental risks such as degradation, microplastics, or chemical leaching have been assessed?

Response

The NoM requests Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on what materials might be appropriate for the program.

Question 9

Previous Use & Residual Contamination - Noting that clay pipes have historically been used in sewer infrastructure, would their reuse require assessment for residual contamination, and what process would ensure they are safe for handling in residential environments?

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 11.2 - NOTICE OF MOTION- ENHANCING
URBAN BIODIVERSITY THROUGH SCALABLE HABITAT INITIATIVES**

Response

The NoM requests Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on the appropriateness of clay pipes being used in the program.

Question 10

Material Condition (Damage / Suitability) - Where materials such as timber have been compromised — for example by white ants or decay — who would determine whether they are suitable for reuse, and what criteria would be applied?

Response

The NoM requests Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on what materials are appropriate and inappropriate for the program.

Question 11

End-to-End Process & Logistics - The motion does not outline how materials would be managed once separated — can officers advise:

- who determines suitability,
- who collects the materials,
- where they would be stored, including whether Council has capacity, and
- what happens to materials not collected — would these remain the responsibility of the property owner to remove at their own cost?

Response

The NoM requests Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details about how the process can be implemented in a cost effective and safe manner.

Question 12

Contamination Management Requirement - If materials set aside for reuse are found to be contaminated — such as with asbestos or sewage — would they be required to be removed and managed by licensed contractors in accordance with existing regulations?

Response

The NoM requests Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on contamination management.

Question 13

Rehandling Risk - Would the rehandling and redistribution of materials increase the risk of exposure to hazardous substances for contractors, residents, and Council staff, compared to the current process where such materials are safely managed during demolition?

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 11.2 - NOTICE OF MOTION- ENHANCING
URBAN BIODIVERSITY THROUGH SCALABLE HABITAT INITIATIVES**

Response

The NoM requests Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on what materials may be considered to be a risk or hazardous and should be avoided in the program.

Question 14

System Risk & Cost - Given that the current demolition process is designed to safely identify, contain, and remove potentially contaminated materials, can officers advise whether introducing additional steps to separate, store, and reuse materials would increase safety risks, require further compliance measures, and result in additional costs compared to the existing process?

Response

The NoM requests Council staff to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include details on what materials may be considered to be a risk or hazardous and should be avoided in the program and any associated costs.

Question 15

Responsibility & Liability - If materials are separated, handled, and redistributed under this approach, can officers clarify where responsibility would ultimately lie if those materials were later found to be contaminated or unsafe — including whether liability would fall to Council, contractors, or the original property owner?

Response

The NoM requests Council to investigate and report back on suitable methods for repurposing materials both new and salvaged. The investigation will include the information outlined in the question.

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026**

**INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 11.4 - NOTICE OF MOTION -
DEVELOPMENT OF A SYNTHETIC TURF IN PUBLIC SPACES POLICY**

Item No: INFOR6/26
Subject: Information in relation to Agenda item 11.4 - Notice of Motion - Development of a Synthetic Turf in Public Spaces Policy
Record No: SU1228 - 29407/26
Division: Corporate Services and Strategy Division
Author(s): Lorie Parkinson

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information in response to questions raised by Councillors relating to **Item 11.4 – Notice of Motion – Development of a Synthetic Turf in Public Spaces Policy**.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In accordance with clause 3.35 of the Code of Meeting Practice the following additional information is provided in advance of the Ordinary Council Meeting.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1

Regional Capacity Context - Can staff confirm whether regional planning work, including across the NSROC region, identifies a structural undersupply of sportsground capacity within the Lower North Shore?

Response

NSROC undertook a "Review of Supply and Demand for Sports Facilities in the NSROC Region" in 2023. This review stated:

"Based on the modelling undertaken for this Review, there is a need to increase the current supply capacity of NSROC by 40% to 2026 and 49% to 2036"

Question 2

Capacity – Synthetic vs Grass - Can staff confirm the typical annual playing capacity, in hours, of a synthetic sports field compared to a natural grass field?

In practical terms, how many natural grass fields are required to deliver the same capacity as one synthetic field?

Response

In 2022 Council undertook an audit of our sports field usage and this audit showed that during the winter season our synthetic sport fields had an average usage of 60.8 hours per week while our main turf fields had an average usage of 32.7 hours per week.

Question 3

Impact of Reducing Capacity - Given that synthetic fields provide significantly greater playing capacity, is it correct that replacing or avoiding synthetic surfaces would reduce overall available playing hours within the LGA?

Response

As indicated in response to Question 2, synthetic sports fields generally have more usage capacity than turf sports fields.

Question 4

Existing Capacity Loss – Indoor Courts - Can staff confirm the impact of the reduction from 9 courts to 8 courts at the recreation centre in terms of annual participation capacity?

Is it correct that this represents a reduction of approximately 53,000 participant uses per year?"

Response

This question is not relevant to the Notice of Motion.

Question 5

Existing Capacity Constraint – Bob Campbell Oval - In relation to Bob Campbell Oval, can staff confirm the difference in usable playing hours between the current natural grass surface and the previously proposed synthetic option?

How does that decision impact overall sporting capacity across the LGA?

Response

As indicated in response to Question 2, synthetic sports fields generally have more capacity for use than turf sports fields.

Question 6

Growth & Demand (POPULATION PRESSURE) - With approximately 4,000 new dwellings planned in Lane Cove, what increase in demand for sporting field capacity is expected over the next 5 to 10 years?

Response

NSROC undertook a “Review of Supply and Demand for Sports Facilities in the NSROC Region” in 2023. This review stated:

“Based on the modelling undertaken for this Review, there is a need to increase the current supply capacity of NSROC by 40% to 2026 and 49% to 2036”.

Question 7

Current Shortfall - Given existing pressures on sporting fields, what is the current shortfall in capacity, and how is that expected to change as population increases?

Response

NSROC undertook a “Review of Supply and Demand for Sports Facilities in the NSROC Region” in 2023. This review stated:

“Based on the modelling undertaken for this Review, there is a need to increase the current supply capacity of NSROC by 40% to 2026 and 49% to 2036”.

Question 8

Participation Impact (CHILDREN) - What assessment has Council undertaken of the impact on sporting participation, particularly for children and young people, if capacity does not increase in line with demand?

Response

NSROC undertook a “Review of Supply and Demand for Sports Facilities in the NSROC Region” in 2023. This review stated:

“Based on the modelling undertaken for this Review, there is a need to increase the current supply capacity of NSROC by 40% to 2026 and 49% to 2036”.

Question 9

Land Constraint (REALITY CHECK) - Are there any realistic opportunities within the Lane Cove LGA to develop new full-sized sporting fields to meet future demand?

Response

Council's current strategic plans do not identify the provision of additional sports fields in the LGA.

Question 10

Evidence Balance - Has Council undertaken a balanced assessment of both the risks and the benefits of synthetic turf, including capacity, environmental impacts, and community access?

Response

No assessments have been undertaken as Council's current strategic plans have no additional sports fields proposed.

Question 11

Environmental Comparison (KEY GAP) - Has a lifecycle environmental comparison been undertaken between synthetic turf and natural grass, including water use, fertilisers, pesticides, and maintenance impacts?

Can staff outline the full lifecycle costs of synthetic turf compared with natural grass, including installation, maintenance, and replacement?

Response

No assessments have been undertaken as Council's current strategic plans have no proposals for new synthetic sports fields to be provided.

Question 13

Policy Readiness - Do staff consider that Council currently has sufficient information to adopt a policy position that restricts synthetic turf to a 'last resort'?

Response

The NOM is seeking the preparation of a draft Policy. It is not recommending the adoption of a policy position at this point in time.

Question 14

CONSEQUENCE QUESTION - If population increases and capacity is not expanded — and in some cases reduced — what will be the impact on access to organised sport within Lane Cove, particularly for children?

Response

NSROC undertook a "Review of Supply and Demand for Sports Facilities in the NSROC Region" in 2023. This review stated:

"Based on the modelling undertaken for this Review, there is a need to increase the current supply capacity of NSROC by 40% to 2026 and 49% to 2036"

Question 15

Source and evidence for synthetic turf microplastics statistic - The Notice of Motion states that *"15% of microplastics in waterways come from synthetic turf."*

Can officers confirm whether the report or Notice of Motion includes any referenced evidence supporting that figure, and secondly, whether officers are aware of any reliable, Sydney-specific evidence that supports that statistic, including from investigations undertaken for installations such as Blackman Park?

Further, given that Lane Cove has a synthetic field at Blackman Park, can officers confirm whether there is any local monitoring or evidence indicating microplastic migration from that site into surrounding waterways, and outline what measures are currently in place to mitigate any potential loss or migration of microplastics, particularly via stormwater pathways?

Response

Notice of Motions are prepared by Councillors. Information contained in the NOMs are not fact checked by staff.

Question 16

Capacity and access implications - In practical terms, if demand for field use increases and capacity does not, can officers explain how access would be managed, and which user groups may be most affected or miss out?

Response

At the December 2025 Council meeting, Council resolved to undertake a review of the needs of local sporting clubs. This review is currently underway.

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 15.2 - PLANNING PROPOSAL 46 - 94
NORTHWOOD ROAD, NORTHWOOD (HERITAGE DE-LISTING)**

Item No: INFOR7/26
Subject: Information in relation to Agenda item 15.2 - Planning Proposal 46 - 94 Northwood Road, Northwood (Heritage De-listing)
Record No: SU10845 - 29735/26
Division: Corporate Services and Strategy Division
Author(s): Lorie Parkinson

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information in response to questions raised by Councillors relating to **Item 15.2 Planning Proposal 46 – 94 Northwood Road, Northwood (Heritage de-listing)**.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In accordance with clause 3.35 of the Code of Meeting Practice the following additional information is provided in advance of the Ordinary Council Meeting.

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 15.2 - PLANNING PROPOSAL 46 - 94
NORTHWOOD ROAD, NORTHWOOD (HERITAGE DE-LISTING)**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1

Group significance - Can officers explain how the heritage significance of Nos. 88 to 96 Northwood Road as a group is considered when assessing whether an individual property should be de-listed?

Response

When the properties were included in the Lane Cove LEP, they were listed as individual heritage items and as part of a group of heritage properties (named 'Rosalie') because they were all similar in character and streetscape.

As a result of the group listing, any proposal to de-list an individual item must consider the potential impacts on both the individual heritage item and its impact on the group.

Question 2

Impact of removing one property - What impact would removing a single property from that group have on the overall integrity and significance of the heritage listing?

Response

The de-listing of this house would potentially undermine the significance of the group of houses and their gardens from 88 – 98 Northwood Road. The property at 94 Northwood Road makes a significant contribution to the group.

Question 3

Cumulative impact - Can officers explain how Council assesses the cumulative impact of changes to heritage items, particularly where they form a cohesive group?

Response

The assessment considers whether the cumulative impact remains consistent with the original listing/s (or not). In this case the level of change that has occurred to houses and gardens is relatively consistent across the group and aligns with what would be reasonably anticipated by the relevant LEP and DCP heritage controls.

The de-listing of this house would potentially undermine the significance of the group of houses and their gardens from 88 – 98 Northwood Road, to which the property at 94 Northwood Road makes a significant contribution.

Question 4

Alterations vs significance - Can officers explain how alterations to a property are evaluated in heritage assessments, and whether alterations alone are sufficient to justify de-listing?

Response

Alterations to a heritage item alone are not sufficient to warrant de-listing. This is confirmed by the Local Planning Panel in the statement:

While, like many heritage items, there have been alterations and additions to the original fabric of the dwelling, it must be recognised that this in itself would not warrant delisting.

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 15.2 - PLANNING PROPOSAL 46 - 94
NORTHWOOD ROAD, NORTHWOOD (HERITAGE DE-LISTING)**

Where alterations to a heritage item are proposed in a DA they are carefully assessed by both planning and heritage experts. Alterations would not be supported if they had detrimental impacts to the heritage value of the item.

Question 5

Threshold for de-listing - What threshold does Council apply to determine when a heritage item is no longer worthy of listing, and how does this property compare to that threshold?

Response

This is detailed in the Strategic and Site Specific Merits section of the Council report in Item 15.2.

Question 6

Precedent risk - Can officers explain what risks or precedents may arise if a property is de-listed on the basis of alterations, particularly within a recognised heritage group?"

Response

The property is identified as part of a group in the state heritage inventory, with 88, 90, 94 and 96 Northwood Road. All four listings are for a house and garden. Removing one will potentially impact upon the character and streetscape of the others.

In the opinion of the Local Planning Panel, the impact of the removal of 1 property from the group was not addressed in the applicant's heritage assessment.

Further, the risk of removing heritage properties after approved alterations sets a precedent for other such requests to be made.

Question 7

Safeguards if de-listed - If this property were removed from the heritage listing, what mechanisms would remain to protect the character and significance of the broader group?

Response

If the property is removed from the Heritage Schedule in the LEP development on the site may not require the lodgement of a Development Application and development under the complying development (CDC) framework would apply. The CDC pathway would have no safeguards in terms of front, side or rear setbacks which would likely result in a development that is out of character with the surrounding heritage properties. This in turn would affect the remaining heritage listings because in addition to being individual heritage items they are grouped based on character and streetscape as well as historical local connections.

Question 8

Streetscape contribution - Can officers explain the importance of streetscape presentation and setting in assessing heritage significance, particularly for group listings?

Response

In terms of the individual nature of the items:

- 88 Northwood Road – is described as a relatively intact Federation brick bungalow (with garden) which still does not appear to have changed that much from that description.

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 15.2 - PLANNING PROPOSAL 46 - 94
NORTHWOOD ROAD, NORTHWOOD (HERITAGE DE-LISTING)**

- 90 Northwood Road – still presents (fronting Northwood Road) as a single storey bungalow with decorative timber to front façade, enclosed veranda and remnant planting.
- 94 Northwood Road – still presents (fronting Northwood Road) as a single storey bungalow with an established garden.
- 96 Northwood Road – still presents (fronting Northwood Road) as a single storey Californian bungalow with typical features and remnant planting consistent with its listing.

The heritage listing for all four properties are for the house and gardens. In terms of streetscape in this locality, it is defined by the large front setbacks on large blocks of land, well-established gardens, relatively low scale development. These four dwellings, despite some alterations, appear to be consistent across all four when viewed from the street (Northwood Road). The renovations on some of the properties appear to be consistent and sympathetic to heritage values.

Any change to this character or streetscape would need a full and proper assessment under the current settings.

Question 9

Consistency across the group - How does this property compare to others in the group in terms of alterations, and are similar levels of change common among heritage-listed properties?

Response

This is illustrated in Figures 1, 2 and 3 and examined in the Discussion section of the Council report for Item 15.2.

Question 10

Panel reasoning - Can officers explain the key planning considerations that led the Local Planning Panel to conclude that de-listing was not appropriate?

Response

The Panels reasoning is provided in the Minutes of the Panel Meeting – attached to the Council Report in Item 15.2.

Question 11

After reading the heritage reports this morning, I request further explanation as to why council has recommended to council that the heritage significance remains listed. I understand this was a planning panel decision though.

Response

As outlined in the Council Report for Item 15.2, the Local Planning Panel considered the proposal and associated Heritage Assessments at their March meeting. The LPP recommended that the property not be delisted as a local heritage item. The LPP considered both the original listing (of 1987 by Moore, Pike, Tropman and Associates) and its purpose, as well as the two more recent heritage consultant reviews.

The Panel also noted that while there have been alterations and additions to the original fabric of the dwelling, this would not, on its own warrant delisting, and that the significance of the listing as part of a group or cluster in this part of Northwood Road cannot be underestimated. The dwelling has the benefit of its extensive setback and garden setting in the streetscape, consistent with the other heritage items in the group/cluster.

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
INFORMATION IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 15.2 - PLANNING PROPOSAL 46 - 94
NORTHWOOD ROAD, NORTHWOOD (HERITAGE DE-LISTING)**

Council planning officers support this position and hold similar views regarding the applicant's heritage assessment's lack of consideration for the full impact of the de-listing on the groups heritage status, or consideration of the fact that the alterations and additions mentioned in the report were in fact underway during the original heritage study in 1987 which recommending heritage listing of the properties.

The LPP concluded that the planning proposal lacks both strategic and site-specific merit.

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
PUBLIC FORUM MEETING - COUNCILLOR INFORMATION SEGMENT**

Item No: INFOR8/26
Subject: Public Forum Meeting - Councillor Information Segment
Record No: SU11033 - 29398/26
Division: Corporate Services and Strategy Division
Author(s): Lorie Parkinson

PURPOSE

The purpose of this memo is to provide Council with information in response to questions raised by Councillors during the Councillor Information Segment of the Public Forum Meeting held on the 20 April 2026 relating to the Ordinary Council Meeting 24 April 2026 Agenda Items

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In accordance with clause 3.35 of the Code of Meeting Practice the following additional information is provided in advance of the Ordinary Council Meeting.

COUNCILLOR INFORMATION SEGMENT

Clarification was sought on whether questions could be asked on Notices of Motion or if questions were limited to Officer reports. It was confirmed that questions to staff should be related to Officer reports, but that generic questions related to Notices of Motions may be asked of Council officers, but that given Notices of Motion are prepared by Councillors and not staff, staff may not be able to answer all questions.

It was also reaffirmed that the current practice is for Councillors to submit questions to the General Manager by Tuesday 5.00pm (in accordance with the Code of Meeting Practice) and written responses will be prepared and published to the website on Wednesday at 5.00pm.

Question 1 – ITEM 11.2 – NOTICE OF MOTION – ENHANCING URBAN BIODIVERSITY THROUGH SCALABLE HABITAT INITIATIVES

Councillor Bennison asked how are clay pots, asbestos and other contaminants are addressed within development applications?

Response

When development applications are approved, they include an obligation to remove any waste materials. As long as this obligation is met, the method of removal or where the material ends up are not addressed by DAs.

Question 2 – ITEM 11.4 – NOTICE OF MOTION – DEVELOPMENT OF A SYNTHETIC TURF IN PUBLIC SPACES POLICY

- a) Councillor Roenfeldt asked for details of the process to develop a report for Councillors to consider regarding the initiation of a Council policy.
- b) Councillor Southwood asked about the length of time for community consultation.

Response

- a) The development of a policy position always comes from a Council resolution whether through a Notice of Motion or the adoption of a particular long term strategic policy. In this instance, the NOM seeks for Council to signal a direction regarding synthetic turf and the development of a policy on this matter.

Should Council vote to progress this, then Council officers will proceed to research and investigate the various technical aspects and identify any associated operational issues in order to develop a draft policy consistent with the position that has been adopted. It is usual practice for council officers to engage with relevant advisory committees or other members of the community when formulating the draft policy. The draft policy is then presented to Council to determine whether to proceed to public exhibition. Council officers then consider all submissions on the policy and may recommend changes to the policy. Ultimately a report, including the results of consultation, officer recommendations and the draft policy, is presented to Council for a final decision.

- b) Community consultation is generally four to six weeks, but this is at the discretion of the elected Council. If it is an issue that is likely to generate significant community views then a

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
PUBLIC FORUM MEETING - COUNCILLOR INFORMATION SEGMENT**

longer period may be required. To develop a policy from start to finish can take up to twelve months or even longer.

Question 3 - ITEM 12.1 – POST EXHIBITION – DRAFT PLANNING AGREEMENT FOR 2-4 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ST LEONARDS

Councillor Southwood asked whether the \$10,000/year would be allocated to Wadangari Park?

Response

It is proposed that the \$10,000 be allocated to maintenance works at Wadangari Park. If the Council see fit, they may amend the resolution to set out what the money is to be used for, to provide transparency for when Council is entering into the planning agreement.

Question 4 - ITEM 14.1 - 2026-2027 COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM – FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

Councillor Roenfeldt asked if Council staff have received correspondence from the Lane Cove Public School P&C that was referred to during the Public Forum?

Response

Council officers have spoken to the P&C and explained the process and the recommendation and that the decision would be taken at the Council meeting on Thursday. The information in their grant application was very generic. Had they included the specifics that were raised in the Public Forum this would have made a difference to the consideration of their application, as the recommendation for refusal was based on Council's general approach regarding potential cost shifting, such as funding teaching staff which is a State Government obligation.

Question 5 - ITEM 15.4 – ADOPTION - SUSTAINABILITY ACTION PLAN 2026-2030

Councillor Bennison asked which actions in the Sustainability Action Plan are intended to be funded by the Sustainability Levy?

Response

The summary in the Council report identifies the projects that are proposed to be funded by the levy in the next financial year.

Question 6 - ITEM 16.2 – PUBLIC EXHIBITION – DRAFT SMALL WATERCRAFT STORAGE POLICY

Councillor Southwood asked is the fee, which is higher than other Councils, intended to cover the cost of impounding incorrectly stored and/or registered dinghies and watercraft?

**Responses to Councillor questions related to Council Meeting Agenda Items Meeting 23
April 2026
PUBLIC FORUM MEETING - COUNCILLOR INFORMATION SEGMENT**

Response

The fee will be used for the costs of impounding and disposal.

Question 7 - ITEM 18.1 – COUNCIL SNAPSHOT

Councillor Roenfeldt asked whether the layout of the Aquatic Centre graphs could be made clearer?

Response

The graphs are taken from the BlueFit management system as images and inserted into the Council report. Council officers will investigate and attempt to improve them.