

THE CRAG

NEWSLETTER OF THE CASTLECRAG PROGRESS ASSOCIATION INC.

No. 114

Seventy two years of community development
ISSN 0814 - 2054

May/June 1997

FBLs: THE BIG ISSUE IN CASTLECRAG

SPECIAL EDITION: CASTLECRAG RESIDENTS' VIEWS ON THE FBL

FROM THE PRESIDENT, BOB MCKILLOP

At the Progress Association's General Meeting of 22 April, a motion was passed to circulate a special Foreshore Building Line edition of *The Crag* to provide Castlecrag residents with the opportunity to express their views on the FBL and that a special meeting of the Association be held on 3 June to consider our submission to Council.

The intention of the motion is to establish a process which allows members of the Association to express a range of views on the FBL proposals and to consider a draft submission which we make to Council on your behalf. CPA members were circulated of the Motion on 29 April and this issues of *The Crag* is the outcome.

Foreshore Building Lines (FBLs) have been the dominant issue in our community over the past three years. The interest and emotion generated by FBLs reflects their role in protecting the natural environment and scenic beauty of Castlecrag. While the issue has been divisive within our community, we consider it to be of such importance that the Progress Association should represent the views of members on the proposed amendments to the FBL to Council.

We have a long tradition of upholding the wider community interest on issues such as this. Our current enjoyment of a wonderful environment owes much to those who had the foresight and determination to set aside and protect our foreshores in the past.

The Castlecrag Progress Association is faced with the challenge of bringing together the conflicting views of its members in order to make a considered response to the proposed amendment to Willoughby LEP 1995 regarding FBLs. **Following the review of FBLs on Middle Harbour by the consultant, ERM Mitchell McCotter, the report and recommendations for revision of FBLs were placed on public exhibition at the Council offices from 8 May. They are on exhibition until 5 June and residents have until this date to make submissions to Council on the proposed amendment.**

Like many other Castlecrag residents, I have been to view the FBL exhibition at Council and I have held informal

meetings with representatives of the various interests to hear their views on the proposals. From the exhibition, I believe the consultants have done an impressive task in tackling the complex issues generated by the FBL debate. The major anomaly of the existing FBLs — inconsistency in applying to some foreshore properties and not others — has been addressed in a consistent manner.

The report highlights the importance of the Middle Harbour natural environment and foreshores. In its submission to the FBL study, the National Trust of NSW advised that Middle Harbour was included on the National Trust Register in 1982 for its aesthetic, geological, ecological and cultural values and that the listing recommends strict controls to protect these values. At the same FBL workshop, participants emphasised that residents had bought their properties because of the unique environment and, therefore, they looked to the FBLs to protect that environment.

My discussions with residents indicate recognition by all groups of the need to preserve our wonderful environment and widespread support for the objectives of the FBLs. In short, FBLs provide an effective legal control instrument to achieve the objectives of foreshore land zoned 2(a2), namely:

"To accommodate housing such that the scenic qualities and ecological values of environmentally sensitive natural areas, including foreshore and bushland areas, are maintained by protecting the land in the zone from over-development or visually intrusive development ... and by ensuring that the new development does not dominate the natural scenic qualities of the locality."

Where differences remain is over the impact of FBLs on individual property rights. The CPA committee has listened to a range of views about the proposed amendments and it will be seeking support for a submission to Council which addresses relevant concerns without compromising the purpose and objectives of FBLs. In the final analysis, the effectiveness of our FBLs in protecting the natural environment will depend on their legitimacy within the community and wider political system. With community support for the final outcome, the role of the FBL in providing the desired protection will be greatly enhanced.

FBLs: THE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Reflections on our Local Environmental Study — twenty years on, by Eric Kaye

During the late 1970s the then State Government required Councils to adopt what became known as a Community Structure Plan, which required municipalities to define Precincts or areas of similar character and community interest. Our Council complied with this request, and at its meeting of 2 March 1981 resolved to call a public meeting of residents and property owners in the Castlecrag Peninsula.

This meeting was held in our Community Centre and was chaired by the Mayor, Alderman J Donnelly, who chose from volunteers, members to form what became known as the Castlecrag Local Environment Committee.

The residents who comprised this committee were: Peter Armour, Edward Bowen, John Davies, Ann Korner, John Llewellyn, Ross MacLean, Addie Saltis, Timothy Trumball, Eric Kaye. John Davies was elected chairman and as an Alderman, I became the liaison officer between the Committee and Council. This Committee was representative of both members and non-members of the Progress Association.. It met as a whole every month and residents were encouraged to attend meetings.

The Study was completed in November 1982 after some eighteen months of quite difficult work. During the study period, Council circulated periodic reports to residents. Later Council placed the plan on public exhibition, both at the Castlecrag shops and at Willoughby Library. The objectives of the Study were stated thus:

1. To conserve the natural and historic character of Castlecrag and its adjoining waterways.
2. To provide and maintain adequate and accessible public open space for the benefit of the local and regional communities and to maintain the natural character of the foreshores and the internal reserves.
3. To maintain the primary residential role of the Castlecrag Peninsula and to maintain the existing residential population densities.
4. To maintain the neighbourhood role of the Castlecrag shopping centre and promote improvements in visual aspects and traffic management.
5. To promote the efficient and safe movement and parking of vehicles throughout Castlecrag and exclude non-local traffic flows.
6. To provide adequate community facilities within Castlecrag integrated with the wider requirements of the Municipality.

The findings of the Committee were published in a document of some 140 pages, defining such things as our historical background, our physical and built environment, traffic problems, and Walter Burley Griffin's covenants. It also defined public and private ownership of Foreshore Open Space.

To achieve the above objectives, the LES recommended the application of building lines to protect privately-owned bushland adjacent to foreshore reserves. Looking back on this work some twenty years on, I consider that the exercise demonstrated that both members and non-members of our Progress Association can work together for our total good.

I also believe that the exercise significantly contributed to the fine suburb we now enjoy.

FBLs: The 100 Metre Option

This option is not included in the draft LEP95 (Amendment No. 3), but is also an important issue facing Willoughby City Council. For information on the 100 metre option, please see box, page 8.

Disclaimer

The submitted material to this issue of *The Crag* has been printed as written by the authors.

The views expressed in letters submitted for publication in this issue of *The Crag* belong to the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Castlecrag Progress Association or its elected committee.

Draft Plan of Management for Griffin Reserves, Castlecrag

Copies of the review plan are on public exhibition at Castlecrag and Willoughby libraries until 2 July 1997.

UPCOMING CASTLECRAG PROGRESS ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

Special Foreshore Building Line meeting
Tuesday 3 June, 8pm

This meeting is to consider a draft submission
to Willoughby City Council on this important topic

Next General meeting

Tuesday 24 June, 8pm

Both meetings at the Community Centre,
The Postern, Castlecrag.

Your say: the case for the Consultant's recommendations, LEP95

The Certainty Principle

There are few things in this world that I am prepared to predict with certainty, but here are two:

Firstly, any substantial change to the Foreshore Building Line in Castlecrag will result in degradation of the quality of the bushland which is this area's most valuable asset and for which it is justifiably famous. The greater the degree of change, the greater the degree of degradation.

Secondly, any increase in what is permissible to be done between the FBL and the water, such as inclinators, steps, garden sheds, boatsheds and gazebos, will also result in degradation of the quality of the waterfront bushland and the scenic quality of the area.

I have heard it argued that other existing controls are adequate to protect the bushland, even without a Foreshore Building Line, such as the Development Control Plan, the Tree Preservation Order and the design of the Scenic Protection Area. But these are all loose controls which only offer varying degrees of uncertainty.

The DCP, for example, requires interpretation in the way it is implemented and is a discretionary control which is not binding on Council. The Scenic Protection Area is very broadbrush. And we all know how effective the Tree Preservation order has been.

For certainty of control, we need a Foreshore Building Line which is clear, unchanged and uncompromising and below which all development is prohibited. Otherwise, it is certain that slowly, incrementally and irreversibly, the quality of our bushland will be degraded.

Peter Moffit, architect



The extensive local public consultation undertaken by the consultant Mitchell McCotter showed that the majority of people want to preserve ecological/natural corridors, scenic amenity and privacy, and conversely, do not want this planning tool removed, but rather strengthened, to prevent unsympathetic development. The FBL has successfully protected bushland, scenic and catchment values in Middle Harbour and its tributaries for many years and therefore Amendment No. 3 should be supported by Council.

Janice and Perry Crosswhite



I write in support of the proposed Foreshore Building Lines Amendment No. 3, as recommended by Mitchell McCotter Planning Consultants.

My home had a FBL in place when I bought it. It protects my amenity. Removal of the line, or watering it down, would fill me with apprehension. At present I enjoy peace and tranquillity — no power lines to interrupt the bush and water view; no unwanted noise rising from below. If the FBL had not been in place, my home would probably be overlooking rooftops and television aerials, pools, inclinators and carports, instead of trees, and the already fragile bushland would be so diminished it could not sustain itself. **With regard to value, I know this home will appreciate rapidly as more and more people compete for positions such as this.**

I strongly reject any move to water down or in any way diminish the FBLs, for once we succumb to pressure and development takes place, there is no turning back the clock. What is lost will be lost forever.

Marie Clifton-Bassett



Forty years ago I was attracted to Castlecrag by the dreams of Burley Griffin — the rocky outcrops, the Australian bush and fauna. Many shared my view.

We made mistakes, but always tried to maintain the dream. Others over the years have moved in. Some support our view; others have no feeling for natural beauty. They have no desire to know the difference between a gum tree or a weed. Their only vision is money floating before their eyes.

Such people are prepared to destroy the magic which has made Castlecrag so unique — for what?

They build larger and larger houses which are obtrusive on the landscape, with double carports and status-symbol swimming pools. These replace the natural rock bushland and gardens with ugly concrete.

I see there is talk of changing the Foreshore Building Line. This saddens me: more ugliness, less bushland.

Can't those who worship only material things realise that it's later then they think? Their best years are behind them and they are now on the final downhill slide. What they own is only on a very short-term loan. They should have some regard for the kids of tomorrow.

My sand is fast running out, but I love this area and would like to see Castlecrag saved for the future. Won't someone please save us from the Greedies?

Neil Robinson



Your say: the case for the Consultant's recommendations, LEP95

FBLs were introduced when the expressway was abandoned, to retain and maintain the existing green belt around our foreshores. Now I hear talk of "compromise". How does one "compromise" a basic principle — and why?

Addie Saltis



The FBLs protect the environment and the scenic beauty of the foreshore areas and maintain the amenity of foreshore properties. They preserve wildlife corridors and protect the area against overdevelopment, thereby controlling stormwater runoff, erosion and siltation of waterways.

Hilda Chapple



Our home was established in Castlecrag 49 years ago. The environs of the suburb were unique then, and will remain unique for future generations to enjoy — providing the FBL restrictions are retained and respected in the spirit in which they were established. We strongly urge the retention of the Foreshore Building Lines in Castlecrag, Castle Cove, Northbridge and Middle Cove.

Joan and Ken Smith



Letters addressing the "100 metres FBL option"

Re the "100 Metre Option":

I urge all residents to visit the Council Chambers to view the exhibition relating to the FBLs. The maps and photographs clearly display the former line and that proposed by the consultants.

Generally, I support the consultant's report which in the main proposes that the FBL follow the contour lines (though some details are debatable), but I was appalled by the so-called "100 metre option". All residents would be by now familiar with arguments for retaining and strengthening the FBLs for environmental, historical and aesthetic reasons.

However, residents may not be aware of the "100 metre option" which is, to my mind, a travesty. The "100 metre option" was not part of the consultants' report and has not been discussed with the community; it was apparently proposed by some councillors as an "alternative". The map in the display clearly shows a line 100 metres from the mean high water mark, an illogical and *ad hoc* line bearing no relationship to the topography or contours of the area.

This "option" provides no FBL below Sugarloaf Crescent, and that for the Northern Escarpment is well below the consultants' proposed line, thereby leaving the bushland with little protection. Compromise is a legitimate tool in industrial disputes, but is not appropriate here. To suggest compromise on an issues so vital to Castlecrag is to misunderstand the issue.

What is at stake is the special character of the suburb. Do we want its special character divided into percentages? Will we agree to 25%, or 30% or even 60% protection? No, I believe we must insist on the protection recommended

by the consultants and vehemently oppose the "100 metre option". While a few native animal species have adapted to human habitation, the majority can only survive in a balanced ecosystem. For example, at the WEPA meeting of 12 May, Andy Burton, joint compiler of The Bird Survey of the City of Willoughby (1995), reported that about half the bird species characteristic of habitats in Willoughby are no longer present, presumably because of the destruction of much of their habitat.

It is vital we permit no further alienation of bushland. As development becomes more intensive in other parts of Middle Harbour which have already suffered substantial alienation (eg Seaforth and parts of Northbridge), remaining bushland areas become precious. **Those opposing the "100 metre option" must make a separate submission to Council. It is not sufficient to include comments in another submission relating to the FBL.**

Margaret Chambers



The "100 metre option" is an *ad hoc* proposal which would not offer sufficient protection for the foreshores of eastern Willoughby. Further, it is a difficult and inappropriate "option" to consider, as the mean high water mark is uncertain.

The 100 metre option would significantly lower the FBL on the northern escarpment of Castlecrag and remove it altogether from areas adjoining Camp Creek and Sugarloaf Creek below Sugarloaf Crescent. These are the most sensitive areas currently protected by the FBL.

If removed, it is very likely that the bushland would be replaced by housing development not conducive to the current amenity of these areas.

Janice and Perry Crosswhite



Your say: the case for the Consultant's recommendations, LEP95

ADDRESSING THE "100 METRE OPTION"

When we first came to Castlecrag some thirty years ago, we were enchanted to find an area which had not yet bartered away its pristine condition, where what we inhaled was purified by the green of the leaves taking in the exhausted air of the city, where native birds came freely to such nectar from yellow banksias and red callistemons, where small, timid animals scurried about the paths, and the rocks gave shelter to gekkos and the blue-tongued lizard.

Castlecrag was largely peopled by a caring community for whom the experience of nature was more important than bulging bank accounts.

It was some time before I realised that what we enjoyed had been dearly bought by some of these people who had dedicated themselves over the years to preserving the poetic and mysterious universe which surrounds our lovely suburb. Thus, they fought the intrusion of a freeway, banded together to regenerate large areas of bush disfigured by the run-off of 'civilisation' and responded freely to requests for advice from those of us whose land had already been degraded.

Many of their battles were lost, of course — the problem about nature is that you can't bank it; still, thanks to their

work, we are all blessed with one of the world's few natural wonderlands so close to a great city.

I for one feel a profound debt of gratitude to these people — most of them unknown to me personally — so I write to support their battle to preserve the existing foreshore building line which, though flawed, has thus far continued to protect some important areas.

Chief among these is the fragile and steep environment below Sugarloaf Crescent. If this line, based on the vegetation and topography of the area, were to be replaced by a blanket FBL line 100 metres from the mean high water mark, there would be no effective restriction at all, since no private property extends down so far. Property owners in this area could then develop at will — an environmental tragedy. Bushland would be threatened, wildlife corridors destroyed and catchment areas polluted.

There are those among us who feel that private ownership of land gives them the right to develop as they please, to come into an area which has been lovingly protected and denude it for their personal profit. I sincerely hope they are not a majority.

Joan McRuvie



About Foreshore Building Lines

Information reprinted from Willoughby City Council's fact sheet available from the public exhibition

WHAT IS A FORESHORE BUILDING LINE?

A line which is fixed on land fronting any bay, river, creek, lake, lagoon or harbour. A building shall not be erected between an FBL and (the above waterways) in respect of which the line is fixed, with the exception of those uses listed in Amendment No. 3 of Willoughby Local Environment Plan 1995.

A foreshore building line is applied for a number of reasons, such as:

- to protect the scenic quality of the foreshore;
- to protect the environment surrounding foreshore areas by:
 - preserving wildlife corridors
 - reducing developed areas thereby controlling stormwater run-off, erosion and siltation of waterways
 - restricting development which may directly impact on bushland areas;
- to encourage the regeneration of land which forms an integral part of the foreshore bushland setting;
- to maintain the amenity of foreshore properties.

COMMON QUESTIONS ABOUT FBLs

What happens to a house (such as a house below or partly below or partly over an FBL) affected by an FBL if it is burnt down?

If a house located below the FBL is only partly damaged due to fire or other natural cause, it can with Council

consent be rebuilt in the same position. If the entire lot is below an FBL, then Council may allow the erection of another dwelling if there is no alternative site within the property above the FBL.

Do I need development consent for maintenance or repair of structures below an FBL?

The current LEP requires that Council consent is required for "erection, repair or maintenance" of structures below the FBL. This provision is under review, along with the categories of work allowed below the FBL.

Is the area below the FBL available to the public?

No. The area below the FBL is still the property of the landowner and can not be crossed or used by the public without the landowner's permission.

Is it possible for a property owner to extend a house where an FBL runs through it?

Any extensions to houses situated on an FBL should be designed to satisfy the objectives and criteria for the FBL. Where possible, additions should be built behind the FBL. If the site conditions do not allow building behind the FBL, then the criteria for the placement of the line must be used to see whether an encroachment on the FBL can be justified.

Small extensions or internal renovations to houses wholly below the FBL can be considered.

Your say: the case against the Consultant's recommendations, LEP95

DRAWING THE LINE ON PEOPLE'S RIGHTS

A number of Castlecrag residents have written letters expressing their concerns about the plans for the Foreshore Building Line (FBL) in the Draft Amendments of the Willoughby Local Environment Plan No.65 (**The Mitchell McCotter** [Consultants] Line and the **100 m maximum Line**) These are currently being exhibited for public comment by Willoughby Council.

For the sake of clarity and the avoidance of repetition their views are summarised below.

After considering letters and submissions from residents Willoughby Council may decide :

- 1 To accept or reject the Mitchell McCotter recommended FBL(See Map)
- 2 To accept or reject the 100 metre maximum on private land FBL
- 3 To implement any FBL or other alternative of its choice.

1 WHAT IS THE FORESHORE BUILDING LINE (FBL) ?

Willoughby Council describes the foreshore building line as being applied “ *to protect the scenic quality of the foreshore; to protect the environment surrounding foreshore areas by preserving wildlife corridors and reducing developed areas thereby controlling stormwater run off, erosion and siltation of waterways ; restricting development which may directly impact on bushland areas; encouraging the regeneration of land which forms an integral part of the foreshore bushland setting and maintaining the amenity of foreshore properties. The FBL currently encompasses public reserve as well as open space and residential zoning on private land.*

2 WHAT STRUCTURES CAN BE BUILT BELOW THE FBL ?

Boatsheds ; Inclinator or other structures designed to provide access to the waterway, eg. pontoons, jetties ; swimming pools, barbecues, gazebos, retaining walls, garden sheds and ; Parking spaces where they can not be provided behind the foreshore building line.

3 WHAT BUILDING IS ALLOWED BY OPEN SPACE ZONING (ZONE 6C)

No development of any kind is permitted in land zoned 6c Open Space.

4 DOES THE FBL PROTECT THE FORESHORE MORE THAN OPEN SPACE ZONING ?

No - it protects it less. FBL's allow boatsheds, jetties, pontoons, inclinator, sheds etc. No development is permitted in Open Space zoning. Where there is already Reserve public land or Open Space zoning on private land the FBL's achieve no useful planning purpose. Council already has various powers, eg. setbacks, tree preservation orders to protect the environment.

5 IS THE FBL APPLIED CONSISTENTLY TO FORESHORE PROPERTIES ?

No - there are huge variations in the amount of private land subjected to FBL's. In some cases the FBL is 400-500 metres from the shore and occupies 80-90% of the property area.

The FBL may encompass the entire house or it may pass through the owner's bedroom or living room. In some properties the FBL is only 10 metres from the water. Some residents have been allowed by Willoughby Council to build huge mansions close to the shore.

6 WHAT EFFECT DOES THE FBL HAVE ON FORESHORE RESIDENTS ?

Residents who are in the position of having 80-90% of their land sequestered by the FBL are unable to do even simple alterations and extensions to their house. *Their property is severely devalued by this restriction.* In some properties the existing home may be below the FBL or it passes through the house. If such a residence is destroyed, eg. by fire, the owner is subjected to the uncertainties of getting Council permission to be allowed to rebuild and may even have to relocate the house. *Their property is severely devalued by this restriction.* Some residents are prevented from building houses on the optimal site of their property because of the FBL's land sequestration. *Their property is severely devalued by this restriction.*

7 DO RESIDENTS GET ANY COMPENSATION FOR THE EFFECT OF THE FBL ON THEIR PROPERTY ?

No - not even if 50% or more of their land is sequestered. Council draws the Foreshore Building Line but the rates remain exactly the same. Land Tax may also have to be paid to the State Government if applicable. If some of the owner's land is zoned Open Space so that their use of it is restricted that part could be sold to the

Your say: the case against the Consultant's recommendations, LEP95

State Government at residential valuation providing compensation. But if there is in addition an FBL on the same land the effect is to reduce the land value so that the Government's offer of compensation is greatly reduced.

8 IS THIS FAIR ?

Ask yourself how you would feel if these restrictions were put on your own home and property ? Then answer the question.

9 WHAT EFFECT DOES THE FBL HAVE ON PLANNING & THE ENVIRONMENT ?

It has been claimed that Walter Burley Griffin sought to preserve the views of Castlecrag by designing houses in harmony with the natural landscape so that they do not block those views. The FBL reverses this ideal by forcing residents - particularly in Sugarloaf Crescent and Edinburgh Road - to build their houses close to the road on the ridgeline of the escarpments, thereby obliterating the view.

Vegetation is thereby denuded where it is most needed. This has contributed to erosion and weed infestation from the top of the escarpments to the shore and valley floor and to the continuing build-up of sedimentation in the Bays adjacent to Castlecrag.

10 WHAT IS THE OBJECTIVE BASIS FOR IMPLEMENTING AN FBL ?

Willoughby Council obtained a report on the FBL from Consultants ERM Mitchell McCotter at a reputed cost of approx. \$30,000.

The Consultants state that the review commenced in July 1995 and took 7 months to complete. Their report [7.1, The Study] states that "The assessment of the FBLs was... reliant upon existing published data, aerial photos and inspections of sections of the foreshore. This material and investigation did not provide a universally adequate data base, meaning the position of the line may not be appropriate in all locations. These limitations need to be recognised and therefore certain amendments to the FBLs proposed by some affected land owners may be appropriate."

The report continues : - 7.2.4 Development Control Plan : - One of the greatest difficulties faced in determining the objectives analysing the location of the FBL was the fact that foreshore management is a complex issue. Trying to solve these complexities with one clause in a local environmental plan and a "line on a map" has problems.

For instance [Council] could address:

- *what happens where a dwelling affected by a FBL is destroyed by natural hazard;*
- *what happens where redevelopment of a property affected by a FBL is planned;*
- *criteria used to define the objectives; and*
- *the criteria for placement of the FBL as outlined in Section 6.1.*

The need to obtain development consent for maintenance or repair of existing structures also appears to be too restrictive. If Council was to prepare a DCP it would be possible to clarify the extent of maintenance and repairs that could be undertaken without the need for development consent.

11 WHAT DOES THE CONSULTANTS REPORT MEAN ?

It means that the whole issue of the FBL is and remains full of inconsistencies and uncertainties regarding the objectives, the planning, the anomalies, and not least the issue of discrimination and fairness to the comparatively small number of Citizens of Castlecrag whom it disadvantages severely.

It means that the existing FBL and the Amendment No.3 of the Willoughby LEP 1995 now being exhibited for comment must not be treated as an immutable law of nature by Willoughby Council and by the majority of residents who are not directly affected.

12 WHAT HAS THE FBL DONE TO THE CASTLECRAG COMMUNITY ?

It has caused bitter division and hostile polarisation. One side is seen as promoting a fundamentalist green "land grab" extending far beyond the foreshores into private property for the sake of bushland preservation disguised as an FBL, with a total disregard for the right to fair and equal treatment and the property rights of the affected residents.

The other side has been portrayed as ruthless "developers", with no feeling for our environment, eager to trample on the bush for the sake of a quick dollar.

FBLs: THE "100 METRE OPTION"

The "100 metres option" would mean that the Foreshore Building Line would be measured 100 metres from the Mean High Water mark, instead of the current placement on natural contours. In places where the 100 metres line would reach *above* the Draft Amendment No.3 — the Mitchell McCotter line — then the Mitchell McCotter line would apply.

The 100 metres option is not included in the draft LEP95 (Amendment No.3) for the purposes of the statutory exhibition requirements of that draft plan, under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.

The 100 metre option would remove the FBL from below Sugarloaf Crescent and would lower it on the Northern Escarpment of Edinburgh Road.

If you would like to make a Submission regarding this option you should make it as a **separate** submission from any submission you wish to make on the draft Plan, (Amendment No. 3). Submissions on both the LEP95 Amendment No.3 and the 100 metre option must be in Council by 5 June.

NB: Paragraphs 1 & 3 are sourced from the WCC FBL exhibition.
Paragraphs 2 & 4 are sourced from the WCC FBL "100 metre option" information sheet.

Your say: the case against the Consultant's recommendations, LEP95

13 WHAT MUST BE DONE ?

A solution requiring some compromise and rethinking of the issue must be found. Willoughby Council and the State Government must give the equitable treatment of people who live in Castlecrag and Willoughby the same consideration as they give to native vegetation and the views of and from the harbour. There has to be a balance between bushland preservation and the "human" rights of property owners.

Write to Willoughby City Council, to the Mayor and to each Councillor and to the Minister for Planning and Urban Affairs and our State Member, The Hon. Peter Collins requesting :-

- 1 That the FBL recommended by Consultants ERM Mitchell McCotter be rejected.
- 2 That where there is Public Reserve on the foreshore or Open Space zoning on private land there should not be a Foreshore Building Line.
- 3 That on private foreshore land the foreshore building line should not extend beyond a maximum of 20 m. from the mean high water mark.
- 4 That the "uncontrolled" part of a residential block affected by the FBL should not be reduced to less than the average size of blocks of land in that area.
- 5 That a NEW Draft Amendment for the Willoughby LEP 1995 incorporating the above changes be placed on exhibition for the consideration of Willoughby Council.

14 FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Contact Nils Korner (9958 6059), Gordon Shrubbs (9958 1974) or Bruce Luscombe (9958 5817)

The above is a summary of letters from the following residents of Castlecrag: Nils Korner, Gordon Shrubbs, Bruce Luscombe, David Bowen, John Syriatowicz, David Bornstein, Margaret Edwards, Jan & Duncan Spencer, Craig McCarthy, Albert Hoggett, John & Robyn Hatton, David Matthews, Chris & Kathy Segart.

The letters herein are in response to the Motion passed at the General Meeting of the CPA on 22/4/97:
That (a) a special issue of *The Crag* be published to inform people of a range of views on the FBLs, and
That (c) a member of the Reform Group select the letters from that Group. The above is their submission.
All members were informed and asked to contribute their opinions to this Special Issue via a letter sent 29/4/97.