

Geoff Brown  
ADI Residents Action Group  
PO Box 4134  
WERRINGTON NSW 2747  
0402 705940

Tuesday, 16 September 2003

Alan Stoneham  
Director of Planning  
Penrith City Council

Dear Alan

At last nights Ordinary Council Meeting I addressed Council tabling a series of questions about the ADI Site St Marys Eastern Precinct Plan relating to item 1 on the business paper. I was informed that you would receive these questions and be the one responsible for responding to them.

As Penrith Council will be making written submissions to both the Eastern Precinct Plan and the Macrofauna Management Plan it is hoped that these questions may assist Council in some way to make an informed comment on behalf of all residents.

It was interesting to note the questioning by Clr Bradbury about the Residual National Estate Lands, which have yet to be formally added to the proposed Regional Park, and the apparent lack of understanding about the status of these areas by Council Officers present. Earlier, Clr Bradbury asked that a briefing committee be formed so that Council Officers could fully inform Councillors on all the documents within the Eastern Precinct Plan. Clr Bradbury's rationale was that this is the model we will inherit soon we need to understand it.

Would it be possible for Council to extend an invitation to the ADI Residents Action Group so that we could be apart of any briefing meeting? This would be of great assistance to our group.

As the community consultation period for the Eastern Precinct Plan and Macrofauna Management Plan ends on October 1 Council needs to act quickly on this matter.

I have attached the questions tabled last night and look forward to a timely response from you on both matters.

Yours truly,



Geoff Brown  
ADI Residents Action Group

Geoff Brown  
Questions to Council  
Monday, 15 September 2003

#### ADI Site St Marys – Eastern Precinct Plan

- Is Council aware that the *St Marys Development Agreement* proposes that contributions from the Joint Venture for Capital Improvements in the proposed Regional Park are to be paid incrementally over the life of the development, meaning that instalments will be paid to fund the Capital Improvements on each anniversary of the commencement of construction of the Western and Central Precincts? (page 36, SMDA) Doesn't this conflict with this report stating that Part A of the Regional Park would be transferred to NPWS as soon as possible after June 16 2003 and the belief that the proposed Regional Park would soon be accessible to the public?
- When will Penrith City Council constituents be able to access the proposed Regional Park from the Penrith end of the ADI Site?
- Why is Council supporting a preference that passive recreational areas be contained within the proposed Regional Park? Won't this further impact on the conservation values of the proposed Regional Park? Shouldn't the developers provide this type of land use within the development areas?
- Does Council believe that the draft Eastern Precinct Plan meets the principles of Ecological Sustainable Development? If so, how?
- Does Council believe that the Eastern Precinct Plan is a model development as outlined in the Aims of the EPS 2000 (Page 2, point 1.2.5)
- Does Council believe that the draft Eastern Precinct Plan protects the conservation values of the ADI Site? If yes, which development control strategies or part of the plan ensures this?
- Does Council concur with the proponents that the creation of the proposed Regional Park is the foremost mitigation strategy to offset the impacts of the urban development? If so, Why?
- Is Council aware that NPWS mapping identifies that 10% of core habitat on the Site, including areas within the Penrith LGA, are within development areas? (page 38, Biodiversity Assessment) Does Council believe that all areas of core habitat should be protected?
- Does Council support the removal of 40 hectares of Endangered Ecological Communities as proposed by the draft Eastern Precinct Plan? (page 55, Biodiversity Assessment)
- Does Council support the findings and methodology of the Biodiversity Assessment that concludes that the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog, the Cumberland Land Snail and the Pink Rice Flower (*Pimelea spicata*) do not exist on the Eastern Precinct Study area (attachments F6 and F8, Biodiversity Assessment) despite the NPWS's, NSW Wildlife Atlas for endangered species, listing their existence
- Does Council support the ineffectual mitigation strategies proposed in the Feral and Domestic Animal Management Strategy and the Weed Management Plan? If so, why?

## Questions - Draft Macrofauna Management Plan

In this report it is suggested that Council support the principles of the draft Macrofauna Management Plan.

- Does Council then support the key recommendation of this plan that kangaroos be culled by shooting?
- Does Council support the second suggested option of culling kangaroos, that of, the administering of a lethal injection after being shot with a tranquilliser gun?
- Does Council support the third proposed method that of sterilisation of both female and male kangaroos?
- Does Council support the removal of Kangaroos off the ADI site?
- Is Council aware that the Minister for the Environment has already ruled out shooting as a method of culling?
- Isn't it the case that despite considerations by the Environment Minister to test the effectiveness of selected population control techniques, including sterilisation and relocation, that NPWS generally are opposed to the removal of the Kangaroos or their integration into other wild populations?
- Isn't it the case that the process of capturing Kangaroos is inhumane and will lead to the suffering and death of many animals?
- If sterilisation is the only humane option left for the Minister to consider, doesn't this mean that all the kangaroos and emus will be herded to the western or Penrith LGA end of the site to facilitate the development of the Eastern Precinct?
- Will they remain there until they start to naturally die out which may be up to 20 years?
- Will Council oppose this if this is the case?
- Has Council considered that the proposal to fence kangaroos and emus within the proposed Regional Park means that the public will no longer experience seeing them from the Northern Rd?
- Is Council aware of the public outrage and concern over the plans to displace the kangaroos from the site?
- Will Council consider the public interest if there is mass opposition to the culling of kangaroos for the sake of the joint venture development?