

---

# Ordinary Council Meeting Supplementary Business Paper

Tuesday 28 February 2023



Notice is hereby given that an Ordinary Council meeting of Randwick City Council will be held in the Council Chamber, 1st Floor, Randwick Town Hall, 90 Avoca St, Randwick on Tuesday, 28 February 2023 at 7pm

**Additional Mayoral Minute**

MM7/23 Vale Maurita Berg ..... 1

**Responses to Questions with Notice**

QN1/23 Response from Acting Director City Planning to Question with Notice from Cr Olive - Randwick Barracks proposed development ..... 3

QN2/23 Response from Director City Services to Question with Notice from Cr Olive - Council's Bushland/Bushcare unit..... 5

QN3/23 Response from Director City Services to Question with Notice from Cr Chapple - Status of Shark Net Removal..... 7

**Confidential Director City Services Report (record of voting required)**

CS5/23 Heffron Centre - HCV#17 - Remediation Variation Claim  
*This matter is considered to be confidential under Section 10A(2) (c) Of the Local Government Act, as it deals with information that would, if disclosed, confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting (or proposes to conduct) business.*

Kerry Kyriacou  
**ACTING GENERAL MANAGER**

## Mayoral Minute No. MM7/23

**Subject:** Vale Maurita Berg

---

### Motion:

That Council send its condolences to the family and hold a minute silence in remembrance of former Randwick City Councillor, Ms Maurita Berg.

### Background:

I was saddened to hear of the passing of former Randwick City Councillor, Maurita Berg on 16 February 2023 at 93.7 years of age.

Ms Berg was a member of the Labor Party and elected as Randwick City Councillor from 1980 to 1983, proudly representing the South Ward for three years.

During this time, Maurita was instrumental in the planting of thousands of trees along Anzac Parade and Bunnerong Road, serving as a screen to the cemetery.

Ms Berg worked closely with Mayor at the time, John Ford and State Member at the time, Bill Haigh on fundraising activities for up and coming politicians including Jannette McHugh.

Ms Berg was cremated on 23 February 2023 with a small gathering held at Yarra Bay Sailing Club whether those closest to her raised a glass in her honour. Council sent flowers to the family with its condolences.

Ms Berg was a dedicated hard worker, straight shooter and will be greatly missed by her family and loved ones.

Council extends its deepest sympathies to Ms Maurita Berg's family and loved ones. Council will observe one minute's silence in remembrance and as a mark of respect for the late Ms Maurita Berg.

### Source of funding:

N/A.

### Attachment/s:

Nil

---

**Responsible officer:** The Mayor, Cr Dylan Parker

**File Reference:** F2023/06574



## Question with Notice No. QN1/23

**Subject: Response from Acting Director City Planning to Question with Notice from Cr Olive - Randwick Barracks proposed development**

---

### Question:

- a) does the Randwick Barracks site contain groundwater with dangerous levels of PFAS (per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances)?
- b) does the bore at Latham Park contain groundwater with dangerous levels of PFAS?
- c) does Council use the bore water from Latham Park for its purposes? If so, what does it use this water for?

### Background:

Defence is currently proposing a development of Randwick Barracks and has completed a Detailed Site (Contamination) Investigation as part of their technical studies. Council received this report last year and has since had expert evaluation.

### Response from Acting Director City Planning (Roman Wereszczynski):

#### Response to part a)

Defence Housing Australia engaged SLR Consulting to undertake a detailed site contamination investigation on the Defence site, prior to proposed redevelopment of part of the Defence land.

In summary, the SLR report provides details of a number of contaminants on the site which would require remediation works to be undertaken to ensure that the land is suitable for its intended residential use.

The report also identified various contaminants, including asbestos, heavy metals, hydrocarbons and PFAS compounds, to varying concentrations.

The SLR report states that the site can be made suitable for a residential land use subject to:

- The management of materials containing asbestos (fibrous asbestos and asbestos fines) associated with historical activities on site.
- The management of elevated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons, bezo(a)pyrene, metals and other contaminants in the soil.
- Further monitoring of the groundwater quality and properties on site, including PFAS (Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances)
- Preparation of a Hazardous Building Material assessment of remaining buildings where they require demolition.
- Preparation of a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) to detail the remediation strategies and subsequent validation of site remediation work.

In relation to PFAS compounds, the SLR investigation identified that PFAS levels in the groundwater exceeded the relevant criteria for drinking water in 10 samples and exceeded the criteria for freshwater in 24 samples.

SLR advise that PFAS was generally not detected in soils sampled onsite and as the site is primarily vacant SLR considered that the site is unlikely to be the primary source, or an ongoing source of PFAS impact to groundwater.

Council engaged Douglas Partners to carry out a peer review of the SLR detailed site investigation report and Douglas Partners advise that the SLR investigation appears to be quite comprehensive and is generally compliant with the published guidelines, including those made and endorsed by the NSW EPA under the Contaminated Land Management Act, 1997.

However, in relation to groundwater quality, Douglas Partners recommended that further testing of groundwater should be conducted by SLR, which will be used to assess any risk posed to the site and surrounding sites (such as the Randwick Environmental Park), as the risk posed by groundwater is not explicitly discussed in the draft DSI.

Council officers have forwarded a copy of the Douglas Partners report to Defence for consideration of the conclusions and recommendations in the report, including groundwater monitoring and management of asbestos on the site.

Therefore, further groundwater monitoring would need to be carried out to fully assess any potential impacts arising from the levels of PFAS compounds in the groundwater on the subject site or off-site, including Council's Randwick Environmental Park and other locations.

### **Response to part b)**

Based on the SLR report commissioned by Defence, the results of background bore water sampling taken from the bore within Latham Park identified that the PFAS level was 0.015 µg/L (microgram per litre).

The level of PFAS is well below the relevant criteria under the Australian Drinking water guidelines and Recreation Water guidelines, which is 0.07 µg/l and 0.7 µg/l respectively.

However, it is the PFAS level in the bore water is above the criteria for Freshwater which is 0.00023 µg/l.

PFAS is typically found in groundwater in urban areas and the SLR report indicated that the PFAS levels reported are likely to represent broader regional impacts from multiple sources.

However, the Douglas Partner Peer review states that further testing of groundwater within the Defence site was recommended by the SLR report to appropriately evaluate the risks (if any) to the site and surrounding sites (such as the Randwick Environmental Park).

Council officers have also arranged for further sampling to be conducted to assess the levels of contaminants (including PFAS) in the bore water within Latham Park, which will be assessed by Council's environmental consultants to ensure that the bore water is suitable for its intended uses.

### **Response to part c)**

The bore water in Latham Park is only used for irrigation purposes in the park and sports fields and at limited times. Council officers have arranged for further sampling and analysis to be carried, which will be reviewed by Council's environmental consultant to ensure that any use of the bore water is suitable for its intended purposes.

---

**Submitted by:** Councillor Olive, East Ward

**File Reference:** F2022/00760

m

## Question with Notice No. QN2/23

**Subject: Response from Director City Services to Question with Notice from Cr Olive - Council's Bushland/Bushcare unit**

QN2/23

### Question:

- a) How many staff are employed in Council's Bushland/Bushcare unit?
- b) Has this employment number changed in a long time?
- c) What is the budget for Council's Bushland/Bushcare unit?
- d) Has this unit's budget remained relatively stable for a while in real terms? In nominal terms?
- e) Has the Council's Bushland/Bushcare unit increased its responsibilities over the same period?

### Response from Director City Services (Todd Clarke):

#### Response to part a)

At present there are 3 staff within the unit. (1 x Supervisor, 1 x Bushland Officer, 1 x Bushcare Officer.)

#### Response to part b)

Team size has remained the same since 2013.

#### Response to part c)

*(non-capital related items)*

Staff	\$236,692
Materials and Contracts	\$671,827

#### Response to part d)

2017/18		2018/19		2019/20		2020/21		2021/22		2022/23	
Original Budget	Actual Spend	Original Budget	Actual Spend	Original Budget	Actual Spend	Original Budget	Actual Spend	Original Budget	Actual Spend	Original Budget	Actual Spend
847,953	892,759	\$866,270	868,394	987,142	\$862,028	\$873,148	982,545	\$893,648	1,060,698	908,789	574,125

#### Response to part e)

Within this time, from 2013 to the present, there has been an increase in the quantity and complexity of bushland sites managed and maintained by the team. However, there has also been an increase in the number of Bushcare groups and Bushland contractors operating within these sites.

**Submitted by:** Councillor Olive, East Ward

**File Reference:** F2012/00347





## Question with Notice No. QN3/23

**Subject: Response from Director City Services to Question with Notice from Cr Chapple - Status of Shark Net Removal**

---

### Question:

Recognising previous motions of this Council (especially on 27/4/21) regarding the removal of shark nets as an ineffective deterrent when is it currently anticipated that there will be enough evidence to remove the nets from beaches in the Randwick LGA?

- a) does Council receive regular data about the animals caught and killed in shark nets in our area?
- b) what is the ongoing cost of maintaining nets and who pays for this?
- c) what steps has Council taken to speed up the process given the high level of community concern about animals including dolphins, seals and turtles killed in the nets?

### Response from Director City Services (Todd Clarke):

#### Response to part a)

NSW DPI prepares and publishes the Shark Meshing (Bather Protection) Program Annual Performance Report. This report includes total shark meshing program entanglements per season reported broken down by area and species.

The Randwick Council data is pooled together with Waverley Council and Sutherland Shire Council in an area classified as Sydney South.

#### Response to part b)

NSW DPI have advised the total Shark Meshing Program contractors cost at ~\$1.8 million per annum in 2021/22. This cost is covered by the NSW Government.

#### Response to part c)

At its ordinary meeting of 27 April 2021 Council resolved:

***“(Matson/Hamilton) that:***

- a) *Council undertakes a trial of SMART Drumlins, drones and VR4G Shark Listening Stations in consultation with DPI along the RCC coastline;*
- b) *Council retains the shark meshing at Maroubra and Coogee Beaches until there is data confirming the effectiveness of SMART Drumlins, drones and VR4G Shark Listening Stations along RCC’s coastline; and*
- c) *any proposed changes to RCC’s/DPI’s current strategy should only be considered after significant community consultation and engagement with the local community.”*

In February of 2023, NSW DPI have conducted an annual survey which seeks to measure the sentiments around shark mitigation approaches currently used in NSW. Once the results of this community survey are announced, the results will be tabled to Council for further consideration of an appropriate strategy.

---

**Submitted by:** Councillor Chapple, Central Ward  
**File Reference:** F2021/00225