

set into the embankment. Using more, but smaller tanks is expressed as another option. Again, worth considering in the context of the other locations.

Yes, these options may be more expensive, and more complicated, involving design issues and negotiations with Sydney Water or other parties. However I submit that the current location does not impute the appropriate value to our scarce remaining open green space. I think we are all aware of the cumulative damage that can result as our open green space is chipped away, bit by bit.

If this plan proceeds with the tank in its current position, I believe the result will be an awful blight on Mackey Park that no amount of interpretive signage can disguise. And you are in a position to stop this happening.

In considering the plan that has been put before you tonight, and adopting the recommendations, I urge councillors to really value our open green spaces. I urge councillors to resolve that the current proposed location for the irrigation tank is not acceptable, and that another must be chosen.

Thank you.

presence considerably larger. It is being placed right near the entry to the park, blocking the main sightline through it.

So why was this location chosen?

The first reason given in the plan is that the existing trees and lower level will help reduce the visual impact for adjacent residents. It is not apparent from the report whether the input of those residents has been obtained. The second reason, which seems inconsistent with the first, is that the site has been chosen for its “high visibility to enhance the proposed (SIS) tank art and interpretation and to reduce vandalism.” During the consultation, we were not shown any examples of this proposed tank art, nor have any details of the art or signage been included in the plan. I submit that “high visibility” is a factor that actually counts against the proposed location, not for it. It seems surprising to me that we even have to argue this point. In any event, I am fairly certain that visibility, tank art and vandalism are peripheral issues.

The next sentence of the plan says: “Proximity to potable water connections and field drainage collection points and ease of access for maintenance.” In short, this was the easiest and cheapest place to put it. Obviously these are valid and sensible reasons for considering that location. However I do not believe that these are sufficient reasons to justify the alienation of this prime piece of our scarce and valuable green open space. Especially when a number of practical alternative locations are evident. I submit that undue weight has been given to factors such as how far trades people may have to walk to access tanks or hypothetical assertions about vandalism risk, while the concept of preserving open space has been essentially disregarded.

Our consultation group suggested that the tank be butted up against the existing Sydney Water facility. The plan considers and rejects this position on the basis that an old shelter and BBQ would need to be relocated, and existing trees might be affected. But the existing plan already provides for the park to be replaced? Surely it is a simple matter to allow for the tank in the new plan? And the qualms about removing trees do not apply elsewhere in the plan.

There are a number of other alternative locations that were canvassed during the consultation process. All I would argue, are superior that that which is presently proposed.

Nearby, there is a strip of land that is already fenced off around the stormwater drain. This is land that is already alienated from public use, and here the impact of the tank would be minimal. This option has been considered, and dismissed on the basis that the neighbouring property would overlook it. This makes no sense to me. That house is on a hill, and the windows would be many metres above the top of the tank. I note that there is no evidence provided that these residents have actually objected.

The plan does talk of an alternative on the other side of the fields, near the Concordia Club. This would be much less obtrusive, particularly if it could be

Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to speak tonight.

I support the plan to act quickly and decisively and secure federal funding to upgrade Mackey Park for all users. I also support the two recommendations:

- that the results of community consultation and site investigations be received and noted, and
- that a further report be provided which takes this input into consideration.

I do, however, have serious concerns that the current draft of the plan, and the report that has been provided for Council's consideration tonight do not accurately reflect the ideas and input of the community, contributed during the consultation process. To me, the report appears to focus on defending the preferred position of the writer rather than considering how the valid concerns of the community might be accommodated. I think we all accept that the ten-year old Red Devil, the commuter, the dog walker, and the reader of Sunday papers under a fig tree all have valid claims on Mackey Park.

Surely it is possible to spend this grant of \$2,265,000 in a way that is embraced by everybody?

My concern is that the plan in its current form does not balance the needs of all users of Mackey Park. I think that there is considerable room for improvement if the plan is reconsidered, and ideas and concerns of the community taken into account.

The issue I will focus on is the placement of the irrigation tank in the current draft of the plan.

As a member of the Cooks River Committee, I have followed the development of the sustainable irrigation strategy over the last few years. I think it is a fantastic proposal, and am keen to see it rolled out.

Last year, I spent an evening attending a community consultation regarding the design and placement of the tanks that will need to be installed as part of this strategy. We discussed size, location, design, signage and other matters. During this consultation, it was put to us that a prominent location might serve to promote the cause of sustainable water use, and educate residents about this issue. This proposition was unanimously rejected. We all agreed that every effort should be made to minimise the visual and physical impact of the tanks.

I don't think this outcome would surprise anyone. We can all anticipate that constructing a large and imposing piece of infrastructure on a such a heavily used piece of open green space is going to upset residents.

Remember, that we are talking about a tank that is 9.35m in diameter and 4.27m high. To give you an idea of the scale, this is the length and height of a double decker bus. The tank will have a footprint of 65 square metres and a