

**MARRICKVILLE council**

**SUPPLEMENTARY  
BUSINESS PAPER  
2**

**for**

**COUNCIL  
MEETING  
09/07**

**6.30 PM, TUESDAY,  
30 OCTOBER, 2007**  
Rescheduled from 16 October 2007

*Distributed 26 October, 2007*

***SUPPLEMENTARY PRECIS***

**The following reports appear as late items with Mayoral approval as information required for the preparation of the report was not available at the time of distribution of the Business Paper.**

**COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES MATTERS**

**CC22            MARRICKVILLE ARTS GRANTS SCHEME 2007 (REVISED)            1**

File Ref: 2792

Council is advised of a proposal to amend the recommendations for the Arts Grants Scheme 2007 due to the changed circumstances of one of the recommended applicants. It is recommended that the report be received and noted; that Council approve the amendment to the recommendations for the Marrickville Arts Grants Scheme 2007 by replacing the recommendation to fund Machine for Making Sense for \$5,000 with the recommendation to fund Mark Wotherspoon for \$5,000 when considering (Item CC 21; Meeting No. 09/07) and that Machine for Making Sense is advised in writing of the decision.

**GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORTS**

**GM 110        SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT – WATERPLAY PARK – REPORT            3  
ON ENERGY AND WATER ISSUES**

File Ref: 2268

This report has been prepared at the request of the Mayor and following discussion with a representative of the Marrickville Cooks River Committee and discusses the energy and water consumption issues for the proposed Waterplay Park in Steel Park. While GM 110 focussed on site location, this report provides information on energy and water issues specifically. The report considers alternative sources of energy and water for operation of the facility. It recommends using existing infrastructure where possible and considers energy and water consumption offsets elsewhere in Steel Park.

***SUPPLEMENTARY PRECIS***

**GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORTS CONTINUED**

- GM 113      SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT – PROPOSED REZONING OF PARTICULAR PROPERTIES IN THE VICINITY OF SOUTH STREET, TEMPE - OFFICER'S FURTHER REPORT      8**

File Ref: P4490.40-02

This report provides supplementary information regarding the report GM 113 contained in the same Business Paper as this report. This report provides a copy of written advice received from the Department of Planning which was referred to in the report GM 113, but which had not yet been received at the time of that report being written. It is recommended that Council receive and note this report and reaffirm its decision not to pursue the acquisition of further parcels of land on the southern side of South Street, Tempe for the purposes of Open Space.

**CC 22 – ARTS GRANTS SCHEME 2007 (REVISED)**  
***For Recommendation***

File Ref: 2792

**Director, Community Services reports:**

**Synopsis**

Council is advised of a proposal to amend the recommendations for the Arts Grants Scheme 2007 due to the changed circumstances of one of the recommended applicants. It is recommended that the report be received and noted; that Council approve the amendment to the recommendations for the Marrickville Arts Grants Scheme 2007 by replacing the recommendation to fund Machine for Making Sense for \$5,000 with the recommendation to fund Mark Wotherspoon for \$5,000 when considering (Item CC 21; Meeting No. 09/07) and that Machine for Making Sense is advised in writing of the decision.

**Background**

The 2007 Arts Grants Scheme was advertised on ACME, local media and relevant web sites in July/August 2007 and closed on 22 August 2007. A combined total of \$97,265 was requested by applicants who competed for the \$30,000 available in the 2007 Arts Grants Scheme. Council officers from relevant sections of Council reviewed the applications. Council staff rated applications against Council's approved Arts Grants Scheme Policy (CC9) eligibility and assessment criteria. Of the twenty-one applications received and considered, six applications were recommended for funding in a report presented to the Community Services Committee Meeting on 9 October 2007 (Item CC 21, Meeting 09/07). At this meeting the Committee resolved to endorse the recommendations as presented in the Business Paper, for consideration by Council at this meeting.

**Discussion**

The Arts Grants applicant, Machine for Making Sense, was recommended for funding on the basis of their application to present a three day festival, the *NOWnow Festival*, in Marrickville in January 2008. The *NOWnow Festival* is an established and well regarded experimental music and film festival and has taken place in the LGA for several years.

Subsequent to the Community Services Committee Meeting on 9 October 2007, Council staff became aware that Machine for Making Sense had posted details of their event on the *NOWnow* website which did not match the project description presented in their application. It appeared that the festival was now taking place in Wentworth Falls in the Blue Mountains. Council staff contacted the applicants and they advised that they had been unable to secure the necessary dates for the festival at local venues The Factory and the Addison Road Centre, and the *NOWnow Festival* would therefore take place in Wentworth Falls in January 2008. The applicants subsequently submitted a revised proposal for a one day event to be held at the Addison Road Centre in April 2008.

Council officers from relevant sections of Council reviewed the revised proposal from Machine for Making Sense against Council's approved Arts Grants Scheme Policy (CC9) eligibility and assessment criteria, and in comparison with all other applications. Due to the significant changes in the applicant's proposal, it is proposed that the recommendation for funding Machine for Making Sense is withdrawn and that Council write to the applicant advising them of the status of their application.

**CC 22 – ARTS GRANTS SCHEME 2007 (REVISED)**  
**For Recommendation**

It is proposed that the \$5,000 funding be reallocated to an applicant, Mark Wotherspoon, for the project *Television within, television without*, a large scale glass sculpture using materials sourced from discarded televisions in the LGA, that will investigate issues around children, television, technology, and the environment. The recommended application meets the eligibility criteria and meets many of the assessment criteria to a high standard. The application is highly competitive when assessed against the other remaining applications in regards to the assessment criteria. In particular it clearly articulates how the grant will be used and demonstrates the contribution of the project to the development of the arts and culture in the LGA by:

- facilitating the development of a large scale sculpture which can be exhibited locally;
- supporting an artistic initiative which investigates community concerns around the environment and technology;
- providing an opportunity for the implementation of a sculpture made with innovative materials;
- assisting an emerging local artist to develop professionally; and
- providing an opportunity for the artist to engage in the life of the community through investigation of his themes regarding children and television.

The applicant proposes to exhibit the artwork at several galleries in the local area. There is also potential for the artwork to be exhibited at major community events such as the Cooks River Arts and Sustainability Festival in April 2008.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment to the recommendations for the Arts Grants Scheme 2007 funding allocation will allow Council to support applications that are most clearly aligned to the aims and objectives of the Arts Grants Scheme Policy and that most clearly meet the selection criteria to a high standard. The proposed amendment to the recommendations will still ensure that a broad range of art forms is still represented in the year's Arts Grants Scheme, reflecting the diversity of arts and cultural activity in the local area.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT:**

1. the report be received and noted;
2. Council approve amendments to the recommendations for the Marrickville Arts Grants Scheme 2007 by replacing the recommendation for funding Machine for Making Sense for \$5,000 with a recommendation to fund Mark Wotherspoon for \$5,000 when considering (Item CC 21; Meeting No. 09/07); and
3. Machine for Making Sense is advised in writing of the decision.

**GM 110 - SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT - WATERPLAY PARK - REPORT  
ON ENERGY AND WATER ISSUES  
For Decision**

File Ref: 2268

**General Manager reports:**

**Synopsis**

This report has been prepared at the request of the Mayor and following discussion with a representative of the Marrickville Cooks River Committee and discusses the energy and water consumption issues for the proposed Waterplay Park in Steel Park. While GM 110 focussed on site location, this report provides information on energy and water issues specifically. The report considers alternative sources of energy and water for operation of the facility. It recommends using existing infrastructure where possible and considers energy and water consumption offsets elsewhere in Steel Park.

**Background**

Concerns have been raised by a section of the community about energy and water consumption issues for the proposed Waterplay Park at Steel Park. This is particularly relevant in the current community debate about climate change and environmental sustainability. The concerns have originated from members of the community engaged in the Urban Stormwater Integrated Management (USWIM) project which has developed a vision for the Illawarra Road Sub-catchment which states:

*“...In 2050, there is native habitat with wildlife around the Cooks River, which is clean and safe for recreation, fishing and swimming.”*

The Illawarra Road Catchment Action Plan was developed in consultation with the community to achieve goals that will meet the community vision. The waterplay facility as proposed would not fully meet some of those targets. For example:

*“Create and promote sustainable water demonstration sites, to inspire other Cooks River Councils, residents and businesses to take up total catchment management practices.”*

The purpose of the waterplay facility is to provide social benefits and improvements to recreation opportunities in the Marrickville South area. Any such facility will have a cost in energy and water consumption. The inherent objective of the water play park is aquatic recreation, and all such facilities will use water and energy. The proposed Waterplay Park will use much less water and energy than a swimming pool. The size of the facility is such that in gross terms, it does not use a large quantity of water or energy compared to other aquatic recreation opportunities.

The size of the balance tank for the facility is nominally 8kL, compared to an Olympic Swimming Pool which holds 1,000 kL. The expected daily water usage of the proposed Waterplay Park is up to 1.3kl/day whereas swimming centres in the Sydney area have an average consumption of 80kL/day (source: Sydney Water website). This is about the same as the daily water consumption of an average '3.5 person' household (using Sydney Water's published consumption of 340 litres per capita per day). The recreational value of the proposed facility is considered to be high compared to the cost of energy and water used.

***GM 110 - SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT - WATERPLAY PARK - REPORT  
ON ENERGY AND WATER ISSUES  
For Decision***

When constructed, reductions in energy and water consumption by the Waterplay Park will be made by reducing the operating period of the facility, scaling the level of activity of the facility (i.e. operating at half capacity), or by incorporating energy and water saving measures from existing or new technologies as they become available and affordable.

Educational values such as responsible use of water and energy efficiency could be built into the project by, for example, interpreting the role of water in our community and explaining the water cycle.

**Discussion**

***Assumptions***

The following assumptions have been made in the preliminary design:

- The operation of the Waterplay Park will not be scaled to season, as it would appear to be 'not working' (i.e. when in operation, 100% of water effects should be operating). The option of separation of water effects is possible. This would allow for reduced operation and therefore energy & water consumption savings, but with some reduced recreation value and possibly increases in operational complexity.
- Actual energy & water consumption will depend on detail design and operation of the facility – the site selection process to date has only considered technically feasible sites, rather than specific performance targets for the project. An extensive life cycle analysis of the proposed options of energy and water consumption will become part of the detailed design brief.

***Energy***

Report to Council GM 110 - Major projects - Determination of a Preferred Site Location for a Waterplay Park at Steel Park, Marrickville (September 2007) Attachment 2 – assumed energy usage of 109.6 KW/day (from Section 9 Operational Cost Plan of \$2,800/year operating 10hr/day @\$0.07/kWhr). The currently available sources of energy at Steel Park are solar, wind and grid, or a combination of these sources. Because grid electricity is available, this is an attractive option because of the lower installation costs. Environmental impacts associated with centralised grid power generation can be offset by purchase of 100% GreenPower. This option could translate to higher operating cost, but reduces the energy footprint of the project. In situ energy collection using solar voltaic panels installed on the DABC (Debbie & Abbey Borgia Centre) roof could be used to augment grid GreenPower and to provide lighting & other internal power needs at the DABC. Installation of such a system would add a significant capital cost component to the project, but potentially reduce costs in the long term. Limited assessment of windpower has been made at this location. However the site is not considered to be a windy location. It is recommended that consideration be given to purchasing energy for the Waterplay Park from the grid using 100% GreenPower.

**GM 110 - SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT - WATERPLAY PARK - REPORT  
ON ENERGY AND WATER ISSUES  
For Decision**

***Water Consumption***

The consultants preliminary estimates of the cost of potable water consumption by the Waterplay Park are approximately \$500/year operating 10hr/day @\$1.05/kL (Report to Council GM 110 - Major projects - Determination of a Preferred Site Location for a Waterplay Park at Steel Park, Marrickville (September 2007) Attachment 2– Sections 8 & 9 Operational Cost Plan). This equates to an estimated consumption of 1.3 kL/day.

There is potential to use alternatives to mains water at the Waterplay Park, however alternative sources of water would have to be treated to a potable standard.

**Use of Alternative Water Sources**

There is a risk and a cost (including energy consumption) to Council in managing the health risks associated with the use of non-potable water supplies in the Waterplay Park. Four criteria need to be considered when treating water non-potable water: risk, cost, technology availability/applicable and perception. These criteria are applied to the quality of water to be used/required at the end use compared to the quality of water at the source. Technically, it is possible to clean any type of water to any quality, but the scale and nett water consumption of the Waterplay Park does not justify the expense of large scale water treatment processes.

The effort and cost of energy to purify harvested water to swimming-pool quality (i.e. ingestible) is very high compared to the cost and quality of using town-supply (potable) water. Non-potable water supply options at Steel Park include:

- post-treatment of water from Discovery Point (high risk for Council, as the source is 100% 'black' water. The supply could be provided from a proposed pipeline route along the Cooks River foreshore to all Cooks River sports fields as part of the Sustainable Irrigation Strategy);
- bore water (a desktop assessment undertaken for Council in 2004 by the University of NSW Water Research Laboratory indicated a low likelihood of finding a usable supply of groundwater);
- rainwater harvesting from adjacent roofs (discussed above, and carrying a lower risk and cost of treatment) for Council than Discovery Point water;
- stormwater harvesting from adjacent fields and paved surfaces (high risk and cost for Council, requires extensive chemical treatment to reduce nutrient/chemical loads); or
- extracting water from Cooks River (requires desalination plant and very high energy and capital cost).

Rainwater harvesting is the most plausible option for the Waterplay Park because it is likely to produce the highest quality, requires little additional treatment and is relatively inexpensive to establish. It is, however, unlikely to meet 100% water demand for the facility, and could arguably be better used for localised toilet flushing and laundry purposes in the DABC (similar to the Tom Foster Centre).

**GM 110 - SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT - WATERPLAY PARK - REPORT  
ON ENERGY AND WATER ISSUES  
For Decision**

The following assumptions have been made in relation to harvesting rainwater from the DABC roof for use in the proposed Waterplay Park at Steel Park:

- The Waterplay Park will consume 476 kL p.a. based on the consultant's cost estimate for purchasing 500 kL p.a. at \$1.05/kL;
- The daily consumption is simply the annual consumption divided by 365 i.e. 1,300 L/day. A more accurate consumption pattern can be determined once the operating frequency and the area of the play park is known;
- Rainwater can be collected from both the smaller front roof (58 m<sup>2</sup>) and larger back roof (288 m<sup>2</sup>) of the DABC. This will require at least two rainwater tanks; and
- Rainwater can be appropriately filtered and disinfected prior to use in the water play park.

Two separate rainwater harvesting models were used, based on nearly 30 years of Sydney rainfall data. Both models gave similar results. The models suggest an optimum storage volume of 15 kL which would deliver about half the average annual water demand of 476 kL p.a. On average there would be about 150 days per year (41% of the time) when the rainwater tanks couldn't supply water to the play park, and potable water (or other water source) would be required.

Given that potable water prices are expected to rise to nearly \$2.00/kL by 2009/10, the use of rainwater in the Waterplay Park would save Council about \$476 p.a. For comparison, a quote received for installing an 18 kL rainwater tank at the Tom Foster centre was about \$22,000. If the budget permits, Council could consider the additional capital costs of rainwater harvesting as part of its leadership role and use the Waterplay Park as a demonstration site for water harvesting.

The specific water consumption will depend on the operation and climatic conditions at the time of operation and will vary with wind strength and air temperature. Water consumption targets can be designed into the facility through the detail design brief, and can be further reduced by varying the operation of the facility once commissioned (e.g. hours and days of use).

***Reuse of Waterplay Park Water***

Over time, water used in the Waterplay Park will increase in salinity and other chemical loadings as it is continuously treated. Eventually this water must be discharged from the system and replaced with clean water. A low risk option for Council to get reuse/increased value out of Waterplay Park water from the potable supply is to send water for secondary use in DABC & other nearby amenities for toilet flushing etc (requires some risk management and chemical treatment) or field irrigation. This would involve additional treatment for decontamination and deionisation, requiring additional plant at additional cost. Reuse for toilet flushing is the preferred option because of cost and simplicity, and these systems can tolerate relatively high salt and other chemical levels in the water.

**GM 110 - SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT - WATERPLAY PARK - REPORT  
ON ENERGY AND WATER ISSUES  
For Decision**

***Location of the Facility***

The ability to use harvested water (from the DABC roof, the amenities block roof or from the hard surface of the facility itself) does not limit the location of the waterplay facility in Steel Park, as the size of the pipe, the distance to transfer water and pump pressure required are not constraints to any location within the park. The DABC forecourt option should not be considered the preferred site because of its proximity to rainwater harvesting from the DABC roof, and the foreshore option is as viable a location for this consideration.

**Conclusion**

The site selection decision of a Waterplay Park in Steel Park is not constrained by energy or water supply or consumption. The resolution of energy and water consumption and management issues will be undertaken in the detailed design phase. Good management procedures demand that the design parameters, including site selection, be agreed prior to commencing detailed design. The design will provide for alternative energy and water management options to be incorporated as new technologies become viable in the future.

Water and energy consumption at the Waterplay Park could be offset by installing ESD measures at the DABC, such as roof water collection and solar voltaic collectors. Council could include more high-end, new technology water and energy solutions in the project, but at a much higher project development cost and including a higher risk management profile. Reduction of energy and water consumption to near absolute theoretical limits is unlikely to be justifiable in this project because of the level of risk and cost incurred. Educational values such as responsible use of water and energy efficiency could be built into the project, for example, by interpreting the role of water in our community and explaining the water cycle.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT** the report be received and noted.

***GM 113 - SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT - PROPOSED REZONING OF  
PARTICULAR PROPERTIES IN THE VICINITY OF SOUTH STREET,  
TEMPE - OFFICER'S FURTHER REPORT  
For Decision***

File Ref: P4490.40-02

**General Manager reports:**

**Synopsis**

This report provides supplementary information regarding the report GM 113 contained in the same Business Paper as this report. This report provides a copy of written advice received from the Department of Planning which was referred to in the report GM 113, but which had not yet been received at the time of that report being written. It is recommended that Council receive and note this report and reaffirm its decision not to pursue the acquisition of further parcels of land on the southern side of South Street, Tempe for the purposes of Open Space.

**Background**

The report GM 113, as contained in Supplementary Business Paper 1 for Council Meeting 09/07, provides information regarding an appropriate way for Council to pursue the removal of the Local Open Space 9(A) reservation zone (under Marrickville Local Environmental Plan 2001) from particular privately owned properties in the vicinity of South Street, Tempe – to assist Council's efforts in trying to avoid the costly acquisition of properties that are no longer required for Open Space.

**Discussion**

Since the preparation of report GM 113, Council has received a letter from the Department of Planning dated 16 October 2007, in response to Council's letter of 8 October 2007 regarding this matter. The letter is included as **ATTACHMENT 1**. In summary, the letter notes that Council will need to:

1. address the requirements of Planning Circular PS 06-005;
2. justify the removal of the open space reservation; and
3. consult with the Roads and Traffic Authority (to the extent that the proposal involves removing part of the adjacent Arterial Road and Arterial Road Widening 9(C) reservation).

Report PR 16, Meeting No. 06/06, discussed the merits of the various parcels in South Street in enhancing the adjoining Open Space and Tempe Reserve. In particular it was, at the time, considered that 43 South Street (Lot B in DP 331917) was of some strategic importance in adding value to this Open Space. Subsequently this position was reviewed having regard to the site area of approximately 1,096 square metres and the anticipated purchase price which is expected to potentially be correspondingly high and the lack of S94 funds. Consequently, it was recommended to Council in the GM 87 report for Council Meeting No. 08/07, that Council had already purchased sufficient land to provide a suitable frontage of Open Space onto South Street. This is particularly so in view of the potential costs and the shortfall in S.94 contributions to pay for it. Council adopted the recommendations in report GM 87 of Council Meeting No. 08/07. It is recommended that Council endorse that approach.

*Council Meeting - 09/07 - 30 October, 2007*

**GM 113 - SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT - PROPOSED REZONING OF  
PARTICULAR PROPERTIES IN THE VICINITY OF SOUTH STREET,  
TEMPE - OFFICER'S FURTHER REPORT**

*For Decision*

**Conclusion**

It is recommended that Council receive and note the supplementary information and reaffirm its earlier decision not to acquire any further parcels of land for Open Space purposes on the southern side of South Street, Tempe.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT:**

1. the report be received and noted;
2. Council reaffirm its earlier decision not to pursue the acquisition of further parcels of land on the southern side of South Street, Tempe for the purposes of Open Space, including 43 South Street; and
3. adopt recommendations 1 and 2 on page 2 of the GM 113 report of Council Meeting No. 09/07, deferred from 16 October 2007.

**ATTACHMENT 1: Total 2 pages**

Letter from Department of Planning dated 16 October 2007.



Contact: Tai Ta  
Phone: 9895 6285  
Fax: 9895 6270  
E: tai.ta@planning.nsw.gov.au  
Your ref: P4490.40-02 JFB:JM  
File: P07/00862-1

Ms Candy Nay  
General Manager  
Marrickville Council  
PO Box 14  
PETERSHAM NSW 2049



Dear Ms Nay

#### Local Open Space Reservation – South Street, Tempe

I refer to our previous discussions and your letter dated 8 October 2007 concerning Council's proposal to rezone certain land located at South Street, Smith Street and Barden Street, at Tempe.

I understand it is Council's intention to remove the current open space and arterial road/road widening zones as they apply to these properties. It is not clear, however, what zone(s) is being proposed. Further, the diagram attached to your letter indicates that it is proposed to rezone a further and significant portion of the existing road reservation to an open space zone.

I am also aware that an email dated 12 October 2007 has been received from Council's Planning Services confirming that Council intends to forward a revised version of the map. This further advice will, no doubt, clarify the matter.

While I can appreciate the financial difficulties faced by Council in this matter, the Director General will need to consider the matter on planning grounds, involving:

- whether the rezoning should proceed at this time, and
- whether the question of the adequacy of open space provision has been adequately addressed, together with the need for part removal of the road reservation.

Council would be aware of the Department's Circular PS 06-005 issued to all councils on 16 February 2006. The Circular provides advice on procedures, including the information the Director-General requires from a council in notifying the Department (under section 54(4) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*) of a council's decision to prepare a draft local environmental plan.

As part of this process, the LEP Review Panel will consider a rezoning request and it will consequently be necessary for Council to formally make a resolution and provide a section 54 notification to the Department with the appropriate documentation as set out in the Circular.

In respect of the removal of an open space zone, it will be necessary for Council to provide sufficient information to justify such a proposal. I note you have referred to the embellishment of the Tempe open space area, however, no further details are provided in respect of the community's needs and the manner in which the embellishment may meet these needs. Further, Council should address whether there exists an imbalance between the provision and the current and future need for passive and active assets.

Similarly, it would appear Council wishes to remove a significant part of the larger road reservation. It would be anticipated that Council would provide written advice from the Roads and Traffic Authority to support this proposition.

I look forward to receiving further information from Council.

Should you have any further enquiries do not hesitate to contact Tai Ta on 9895 6285.

Yours sincerely

Handwritten signature of G. Watson and the date 16/10/07.

Andrew Watson  
**Regional Director**  
**Sydney South West**