

HPG Submission regarding the Draft Middle Head Management Plan (Amendment 2)

HEADLAND PRESERVATION GROUP INC.

The Headland Preservation Group Inc. (HPG) was formed in 1996 to fight against surplus military land on Middle Head being sold for residential development. As a result of concerted community action the Commonwealth Government changed its mind and decided to rehabilitate the land and in due course transfer it to NSW for inclusion in the Sydney Harbour National Park.

In 1998 John Howard announced that this land together with land on North Head and Georges Heights would be returned to the people of Australia to commemorate Federation. His announcement in part read;

..... the Government has devised a long-term plan to return surplus military land to the people of Australia.... We're going to establish a Sydney Harbour Federation Trust and the purpose of that trust is to maximise public access to the land being returned to the people and to rehabilitate the natural values.... It will preserve heritage buildings and features of the sites.

.... it will ensure that there is maximum weight given to the desire, not only of local residents, but the desire of all Australians that the maximum advantage be derived in open space and recreational purposes in relation to the land.

I am immensely proud of the foreshores of Sydney Harbour. It is a great national asset. It is an asset that belongs to all of the Australian people...

HPG supported the Harbour Trust until 2013 when it became necessary to challenge the Government's decision to allow the development of an aged care facility on Middle Head in place of the historic 10 Terminal building.

With this decision now reversed, HPG is seeking to work with the Harbour Trust to find a use for the building that is consistent with the Harbour Trust's Comprehensive Plan.

THE SUBMISSION

This submission by HPG addresses the *Draft Sydney Harbour Federation Trust Management Plan – Mosman No 7 (Middle Head) Amendment No 2* (the “**Draft Management Plan**”), which was released for public comment on 3 November 2016.

Management Plans are a requirement of the Comprehensive Plan (2003) that provides the strategic direction and planning context for all Harbour Trust lands. The Draft Management Plan describes specific outcomes for the Middle Head precinct.

This submission examines the Draft Management Plan in the context of the Comprehensive Plan (2003), the original Management Plan (2007) and the Amended Management Plan (2014).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Introduction of the Draft Management Plan reads,

*The Comprehensive Plan proposes the creation of a **Headland Park** that integrates Middle Head, Georges Heights and Chowder Bay. The Headland Park will unify all of the elements along the Middle Head ridgeline, from Rawson Park to Middle Head.*

The vision for the park is a place where the area's rich natural and cultural heritage, including its early Aboriginal and military occupation will be protected and interpreted and where access will be provided to areas that have long been inaccessible to most people".

HPG whole-heartedly supports this Vision but has five principal concerns in respect of the Draft Management Plan that need clarification and/or further information.

- Interpretation for visitors to understand and appreciate the totality of the Headland Park's heritage lacks detail on how this will be achieved.
- For visitors to experience and learn about this unique cultural heritage, the Headland Park will require effective collaboration between the Harbour Trust and National Parks and Wildlife Service NSW (NPWS), not just words in a plan.
- The proposed adaption of 10 Terminal to increase functionality raises a number of questions
- Transport to and through the Headland Park remains insufficient to maximise public access.
- The issue of synthetic turf on Middle Head Oval remains unresolved.

1. INTERPRETATION

It is relevant and important to revisit the intentions spelt out clearly in the Comprehensive Plan (2003) – Chapter 7, Middle Head, Page 118

Education and Interpretation

The Plan for Middle Head-Georges Heights and Chowder Bay proposes cultural and educational activities to explain the heritage values of the area within a whole of harbour context.

The network of paths and access routes would themselves be interpretive signposts, linking the various precincts and highlighting the natural beauty of the area.

The legacy of defence initiatives and installations are directly related to the defence of Sydney from early Colonial days to World War II. The whole defence heritage of Middle Head and Georges Heights is to be interpreted through the conservation of significant buildings and structures, re-instating or conveying previous patterns of land use and access to the gun emplacements. Provision of an interpretative centre will also be investigated. Partnerships with other agencies, historical societies and museums in Sydney and elsewhere could extend the educative and interpretive reach of the area.

The development of an Aboriginal Cultural Centre will be investigated with the Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council. It could serve as a focal point for the Aboriginal people of the Sydney region to pursue cultural interests, to conserve and protect heritage sites and to interpret the headland and early contact between the Europeans and Aboriginal people, such as Bungaree's farm.

AND

The Trust will work with the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service to integrate the interpretive experience of Trust land and the National Park (page 118)

The Draft Management Plan (under Implementation of the Action Plan, Outcome on Page 93) reads;

improved interpretation of site's natural and cultural heritage by providing interpretive material and signage

However, the action element *"Investigate providing a visitor's centre as part of a new Pavilion"* is only given a medium priority and no supporting detail.

In short, after 13 years since the statutory Comprehensive Plan was approved there has been minimal action addressing education and interpretation of the unique combination of military and indigenous history of the area and no action on a visitors' centre.

This is totally unacceptable. There must be a specific location set aside to acknowledge the Headland Park's importance in Australia's indigenous, military, natural, cultural and built heritage.

There is significant indigenous history associated with Middle and Georges Heads and stories that need to be told like Captain John Hunter's first encounter with aborigines north of the harbour, when his marines and aborigines danced together on Cobblers Beach. Much can be learned from Governor Macquarie's "grant" of land and a rowing boat to Bungaree. Bungaree was to supply the colony with fruit and fish. Why this "integration" attempt did not succeed is the first example of how both cultures failed to understand each other.

Middle and Georges Heads boast a military use spanning over 200 years with their fortifications and associated military infrastructure largely preserved.

In the Vietnam War the 10 Terminal base became a training site for 'Code of Conduct' courses for junior officers and NCOs in the event of capture. It was the base for Australia's involvement in PNG and the Pacific through the activities of ASOPA, and the amphibious transport unit responsible for opening up and annual resupply of Australia's bases in Antarctica.

There is a great opportunity to tell the story of Middle Head together with Chowder Bay and Georges Heights in such a way as to attract visitors and preserve its history for future generations.

A key step to realising this opportunity and fulfilling the education and interpretation objectives of the Draft Management Plan and the Comprehensive Plan would be to establish a "Discovery Centre" guiding visitors, including students and tourists, through the indigenous, military and other history of the Headland Park. Such a centre would not be a static museum, but combine interactive elements to create a vibrant interesting journey covering all aspects of the long occupation of Middle Head.

Appendix A - "Middle Head Story" describes the story in more detail.

2. COLLABORATION WITH NPWS

The Harbour Trust and NPWS have agreed to work collaboratively on their plans as specified in the above stated aims of the Draft Management Plan. Their aim to coordinate decision-making and planning so as to create a seamless visitor experience without visitors recognising the different tenures is applauded.

For example,

the road geometry, topography and landscape treatment will be designed to work together and create a sense of arrival at the ASOPA / 10 Terminal precinct as well as to the fortifications at the entrance to Sydney Harbour National Park.

If ever there was an example of why NPWS and the Harbour Trust need to work together it is the necessity for integrated use of the NPWS buildings and adjacent Harbour Trust buildings.

Both the NPWS Masterplan and the Harbour Trust's Draft Management Plan accept the need for a Visitors' Centre.

However, NPWS proposes that its "**Orientation facility**" could occupy the NPWS Guard house and comprise an internal display, café and deck, while the Harbour Trust proposes that its **Visitors' Centre** could be located in its former Guardhouse (the current Middle Head café) or in a readapted pavilion on the eastern side of Middle Head oval.

The NPWS **Masterplan** Vision Statement reads

*Middle Head and Georges Head will be an integral component of the Sydney Harbour scenic walk providing cultural events, community activities and facilities. Understanding of the site's natural and cultural values will be encouraged and **visitors will have a seamless experience** with neighbouring parklands.[emphasis added]*

The area from Burnt Orange to the Soldiers' Institute is currently the natural visitor hub for the whole headland from Georges Heights to Chowder Bay. It cries out for a "Discovery Centre". Unfortunately both NPWS and the Harbour Trust appear to be planning the adaptive reuse of their built heritage in isolation from one another. What is needed is an integrated "Discovery Centre" located at a suitable arrival point to serve visitors to both NPWS and Harbour Trust lands.

This should be located in a building large enough to accommodate;

- Displays giving an introduction to the whole "**park**" – from the Middle Head forts to Bradleys Head, including Georges Heights and Chowder Bay and covering both NPWS and Harbour Trust lands.
- Visitor information area, including maps, self-guided tour options, guided tours information and bookings.
- Interactive displays and interpretation of the cultural heritage of the park, including its extensive military history and indigenous heritage and ASOPA history.
- Educational facilities for students and visitors.
- Café/s and bookshop/souvenirs
- Small retail or other facilities if appropriate

Neither of the guardhouses proposed for such purposes is large enough or suitable for what is required. The ideal, indeed the only existing building suitable for a Discovery Centre as just described is the 10 Terminal complex of buildings.

This complex or a significant part thereof would serve the needs of both NPWS and the Harbour Trust. Additionally, one of the outcomes of the Draft Management Plan (Section 10 – Outcomes) is to,

adaptively re-use the buildings of ASOPA and 10 Terminal in a manner that retains and conveys their heritage values and contributes positively to the experience of visitors to the Headland Park".

10 Terminal is a large building complex which lends itself to many uses especially where the Harbour Trust could "*work collaboratively with NPWS in the coordinated management of the whole headland*" (10.1)

The accommodation at 'Lands Edge' at Chowder Bay could work in with the Discovery Centre in this complex, enabling many students to stay overnight on Middle Head and benefit from an immersion in Australia's military, indigenous and natural history and culture. The educational benefits arising from this experience would be invaluable.

3. ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO 10 TERMINAL

The original Middle Head Management Plan 2007 (page 42) clearly states the intention for 10 Terminal. HPG believes this intention should remain, specifically,

The brick buildings on the south side of the road [i.e. 10 Terminal] will be conserved and adaptively reused in a manner that facilitates the conservation and interpretation of the heritage values and that enhances the visitor experience of the park, for example: visitor accommodation, dining, functions, offices, studios, education or similar. The adaptive reuse of the site must ensure ongoing public access and enhance the visitor experience to the headland.

The Draft Management Plan proposes a number of alterations from the original 2007 Plan for 10 Terminal that require more detail.

- a) The **building footprint** of the 10 Terminal complex set out in the Draft Management Plan is a significant reduction compared to the existing plan (Amendment 1 - 2014). However it still exceeds the original 2007 Plan. As a generalisation HPG opposes any increases in the structural footprint from the original 2007 Plan.

HPG considers it essential to maintain the original layout of the whole 10 Terminal complex (subject to removal of the boiler house). It is a template for the design of military barracks and administration bases used throughout the British Empire at the time of its construction. It is Commonwealth Heritage listed and is the only remaining intact example of this layout in Australia.

- b) The Draft Management Plan says the **Boiler House** (Building 2) may be removed and that there may be additional buildings constructed within this courtyard, and also within the smaller courtyards between the building wings (Page 79).

The detail of what might be proposed is vague. However the wording implies the potential for more than one building and a change in the existing footprint of the complex. HPG's position is as follows;

- HPG supports removal of the Boiler House.
 - HPG would oppose permanent roofing of the main courtyard. It is important to keep the open courtyard feel and not create another indoor space.
 - Any additional building footprint other than a narrow internal open veranda around the main courtyard is not supported.
 - HPG does not support any additional built area within the smaller courtyards between the building wings of Building 3. Those smaller courtyards provide light and a sense of space integral to the design and layout of the building.
 - HPG opposes any new building that changes the basic structural footprint but would not oppose additional shade and weather protection so long as it did not detract from the integrity of the building's heritage value
- c) Additional uses mentioned are well-being, cultural activities, small scale retail – agreed, provided these do not detract from the presentation of the heritage values of 10 Terminal.
- d) The courtyard formed by Building 3 will be landscaped to improve amenity – agreed.
- e) HPG believes the garage/workshop Buildings 6 and 7 should not be used for any form of garaging or storage.

Bennett Murada Architects, who were the architects for the boutique hotel EOI and who assisted HPG with its Alternative Proposal given to Minister Greg Hunt, have detailed knowledge of the layout of the 10 Terminal complex. They described potential use of the

Buildings 6 and 7 as follows:

“Hospitality/Function/Restaurant. Adaptive reuse of the high volume structures with great bones as a high yielding venue centred around a courtyard, with a legible street address and identity”.

The Draft Management Plan says a new addition linking Buildings 6 and 7 may be constructed to improve the amenity and functionality of the garages for their new use. Whether this means a covered walkway or enclosure of the whole space is unclear. Either way HPG believes a link is unnecessary and would detract from the buildings’ potential.

HPG does not object to a second floor or mezzanine floor within Building 7 to enhance potential uses but only without change to the design or height of the roof.

There should be no second storeys to any of the other 10 Terminal buildings.

- f) HPG notes that there is no scheduling of any maintenance or rehabilitation work on the 10 Terminal complex in the Implementation and Action Plan section of the Draft Management Plan. HPG considers that this should be given a high priority

From the above it is apparent that the Draft Management Plan attempts to describe possible adaption of 10 Terminal to improve its functionality. While HPG accepts the need for appropriate adaptive re-use, there is the risk of being so prescriptive on the one hand that innovative concepts are not considered or being too general on the other as to allow anything.

HPG considers that the best way to handle this dilemma is to provide examples of acceptable and unacceptable adaptations and uses from which guidelines can be more easily developed. HPG is formulating such examples and looks forward to discussing these with the Harbour Trust.

4. TRANSPORT

The Introduction to the Draft Management Plan says,

The Harbour Trust has identified the creation of the Headland Park as one of its highest priorities”. Further that “the area’s rich natural and cultural heritage, including its early Aboriginal and military occupation will be protected and interpreted and where access will be provided to areas that have long been inaccessible to most people” (Page 8)

The Harbour Trust says one of its aims is to improve public transport service and that this has been “Achieved” (page 91). The HPG begs to differ. While Sydney Buses now provide a service to Chowder Bay, this is only part of the solution. To encourage and facilitate visitation to the Headland Park, transport opportunities for visitors need to be much broader.

For example, the whole headland from Georges Heights to Chowder Bay needs an integrated transport solution encompassing a ferry to/from Chowder Bay/Circular Quay, shuttle bus service within Headland Park and possible connection with Mosman Rider. Indeed the Comprehensive Plan (2003) says on Page 119

Within the Headland Park, the reliance on private vehicle use will be minimised in favour of public transport, shuttle services and water transport.

HPG recognises that without a critical mass of people visiting the site, the necessary transport is difficult to justify. But without appropriate transport it will be difficult to generate the critical mass of visitors, which the site deserves.

5. MIDDLE HEAD OVAL, PAVILION AND OTHER MATTERS

- a) HPG sees **Middle Head Oval** as an important open natural space at the entrance and introduction to the Headland Park and agrees with its continued use as a sporting venue. However, HPG strongly recommends that the oval, and indeed all Harbour Trust land be protected from sectional interests whether municipal, commercial or otherwise.

There is now considerable pressure from the sporting lobby to replace the natural grass of the oval with synthetic turf to achieve greater playing time. In addition to unresolved health concerns to players, synthetic turf raises two environmental issues.

First, HPG sees the maintenance of a natural grass surface on the oval as important in a bushland park setting. This is particularly important as it is the stated intention of the Commonwealth Parliament that suitable Harbour Trust land be transferred to the national parks and reserves system, and legal advice from the NSW EDO (the Environmental Defenders Office) is that replacement of the natural grass of the oval with a synthetic playing field may frustrate that intention.

Further, the Draft Management Plan is specific about improving stormwater collection and drainage. In this regard the potential for micro plastic contaminated run-off to Middle Harbour from synthetic turf on the oval cannot be ignored.

All 'actions' on Trust land or on adjoining land, undertaken either by or on behalf of the Harbour Trust, are subject the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act, 1999 as amended. Should the Harbour Trust permit synthetic turf on the oval, it could be challenged under the EPBC Act for permitting known pollutants to be discharged to the environment.

- b) HPG agrees with the demolition of the **Barrack buildings 2 and 3**, relocation of the **pavilion** to the eastern side of the oval and the adaptive re-use of part of the **Barrack 1** building space for uses similar to the exiting pavilion used by the sporting bodies.

Any adaption or rebuilding of the Barrack 1 building must not exceed the existing footprint and should match the architectural style and roof form. The choice of exterior materials should interpret and be sympathetic to the existing military character of the barracks building and not increase and preferably reduce its visibility from the harbour.

- c) HPG supports the proposed adjacent **playground**. However; it should be constructed of materials that are sympathetic with the natural environment of a national park and visually unobtrusive.
- d) **Landscape** - HPG agrees with the Harbour Trust's plan of retaining and enhancing the open, institutional park-like setting of the ASOPA and 10 Terminal complexes. HPG agrees with reducing the parking at the end of the south east car park to expand the public landscaped area in front of the ditch and using the wash down bays for water features and the landscaping of the area.

HPG agrees with maintaining the historic Middle Head Road as a reduced speed road.

- e) **Car Parking** – HPG is not in favour of providing additional parking in the pocket between 10 Terminal and ASOPA. This would detract from the setting of 10 Terminal and impinge on the park-like setting of the whole complex.

If it is physically possible HPG believes three rows of parking in the car park between Middle Head Road and the Barracks buildings is a preferable solution

6. PHILANTHROPY

Heritage might be described as understanding where we came from, what we did, how we did it and most important why we did it at the time. It is a significant aspect of our societal culture proven to have positive benefits for individual wellbeing and sense of identity and hence for the wellbeing of the community overall.

Heritage can be best understood by being able to see and experience the built environment of the time. Such built environment may not be aesthetically appealing but why and how a building was designed, constructed and used helps society learn from the past.

Together with the arts, the protection, conservation and interpretation of our built heritage are a cultural good, which require support.

Philanthropic support is a potentially valuable avenue by which to achieve heritage conservation where public funding is unavailable and commercial revenue-raising activities would be inappropriate.

Recognition of philanthropic support for particular heritage conservation actions would be a reasonable expectation of both the donor and the public, provided that such recognition did not detrimentally affect perceptions of the heritage concerned. It would be important for example that such recognition did not convey the impression that the donor exercised ownership or control of public heritage but only that the donor was assisting in achieving a public good.

In the same way that philanthropic support of the arts is generally recognised by statements of sponsorship or support in printed programs and publicity material for artistic events, recognition of philanthropic support of heritage conservation could be through acknowledgment of support in appropriate ways, such as acknowledgments

- in relevant information brochures and tour guides
- at relevant information displays, whether 'on site' or elsewhere
- in publicity material relating to the heritage elements concerned.

HPG recognises that public funding is not unlimited and believes that there are opportunities for philanthropic support to assist the Harbour Trust in respect of proposals for the Headland Park. HPG would like to work jointly with the Harbour Trust and NPWS to develop projects that might appeal to philanthropic providers.

Although HPG does not itself have the resources to implement such projects, HPG's membership has an existing and potential network of skills, experience and contacts to generate and evaluate proposals consistent with the visions of the Harbour Trust and NPWS for the Headland Park and Middle and Georges Heads and to explore avenues for philanthropic support for such proposals.

Examples of how such support might operate are described in Attachment B.

CONCLUSION

HPG supports in large measure the vision and outcomes of the Draft Management Plan but would like to see;

- Priority given to a joint Harbour Trust/NPWS Discovery Centre
- Details of how the Middle Head story can be told
- Clearer guidelines on how 10 Terminal might be adapted and reused
- Commitment to a joint Harbour Trust/ NPWS transport solution for the whole headland
- Rejection of synthetic turf on Middle Head oval.

Julie Goodsir

President

The Headland Preservation Group Inc.

16 December 2016

HPG Committee

Julie Goodsir – President

Jill L’Estrange – Vice President

Linda Bergin OAM – Deputy Vice President

Eve Bagnall – Treasurer

Antony MacCormick – Secretary

Rob Bagnall

Laura Cunningham

Tim James

Pam Sommerville

Barry Woods

APPENDIX A - THE MIDDLE HEAD STORY

Middle Head is commonly understood to be the area from Georges Heights and Chowder Bay to the headland itself. [That is different from the Harbour Trust's Middle Head precinct, which is essentially limited to the area between Burnt Orange and the ditch at the entrance to the Sydney Harbour National Park.]

Middle Head is recognised as a beautiful oasis in the midst of a city of 4.3 million people. The whole area in some publications (such as the Harbour Trust's Comprehensive Plan) is also referred to as the Headland Park. We are fortunate that, because of its exclusive military use spanning over 200 years, its fortifications and associated military infrastructure has largely been preserved. This offers a tremendous opportunity to tell the indigenous and military story of Middle Head in such a way as to attract many more visitors than at present and preserve its history for future generations.

A key step to achieving this objective is to establish a "Discovery Centre" guiding visitors through the entire indigenous and military history of Middle Head. Such a centre would not set out to be a museum, but would provide a vibrant interesting journey through all aspects of the fascinating evolution and occupation of Middle Head.

The Discovery Centre would provide visitors with an understanding of why fortifications and military infrastructure were first established and how military thinking, technology and use changed over time. This is an essential precursor for visitors before moving onto tours (guided or self-guided) to appreciate the significance of the defensive and support infrastructure they are about to visit.

The indigenous history of the area is also enlightening. It was called Cubba Cubba meaning large head. The Borogegal people lived on Middle Head for 40,000 years – there is still archaeological evidence of their occupation such as rock carvings and middens. Indigenous warriors danced with Captain Hunter and his marines on Cobblers Beach, Middle Head on 29 January 1788. This was the first encounter between white men and indigenous people on the north shore of Sydney Harbour.

Governor Macquarie gave Bungaree and his followers a rowing boat and the first indigenous land grant on this headland. Macquarie appreciated the aborigines' great fishing skill and wanted help to feed the starving colony. The hoped for farming venture failed and the reason for its failure is a lesson in itself. It is first example of how both cultures failed to understand each other. Bungaree's walking track to Chowder Bay is still used.

One of the least appreciated facts of our military history is the large number of aborigines who served in Australia's defence forces over the years and what they achieved. The Discovery Centre is an appropriate place to record and illustrate this.

The history of ASOPA is also an interesting story. Australia after WW2 was charged with the legacy of overseeing PNG as a protectorate, which it we did for 29 years. There is a great history here and a close relationship with our closest northern neighbour. This history and stories need to be acknowledged and told. The ASOPA buildings were also briefly used at one stage as the Head Quarters of ASIO.

There is a fascinating but largely unknown story in the ASOPA buildings of how a varied group of talented intellectuals, in the dark days of 1942, provided high-level policy advice to Australia's most senior soldier, General Blamey, and through him to the Government for the remainder of the war and beyond. This band of academics, lawyers and New Guinea patrol officers formed a unique military unit, the Directorate of Research and Civil Affairs, under the command of an eccentric and masterful string-puller, Alf Conlon.

The Directorate was a pioneer in developing approaches to military government in areas liberated by the combat troops, as demonstrated by the Australian Army in New Guinea, and Borneo in 1945-46. It is an issue of enduring importance. The Directorate established the Australian School of Pacific Administration, and had an important role in founding the Australian National University. Sir John Kerr (late Governor General of Australia) was the Organising Secretary for the Preparatory Conference held at ASOPA in 1947.

In the Vietnam War the 10 Terminal base became a training site for **'Code of Conduct'** courses for junior officers and NCOs in the event of capture. The course was based on the terrible experiences of Australian and allied POWs during WW2 and the Korean War. It took place in the 'tiger cages' within the fortifications and can be visited. The chilling and remarkable account of the **'torture training'** of Australian war hero **Captain Barry Peterson** at Middle Head is screaming to be told.

Middle Head was also the base for Australia's involvement in PNG and the Pacific through the activities of ASOPA, and the amphibious transport unit responsible for opening up and annual resupply of Australia's bases in Antarctica.

There is a great opportunity to tell the story of Middle Head together with Chowder Bay and Georges Heights in such a way as to attract visitors and preserve its history for future generations.

The Draft Management Plan and the Conservation Management Plans prepared for the Harbour Trust include a vast amount of history pitted with interesting facts and stories relevant to Middle Head. The key to increasing visitor numbers is to cater for a wide range of interests. Well-presented, historic sites are a proven drawcard for many people. The success of the recently refurbishment Bletchley Park in the UK is a notable example.

Possible steps on how to achieve the vision in the Draft Management Plan for interpreting the heritage of Middle Head and how the story might be told are:

1. Establish a Discovery Centre in part of 10 Terminal taking visitors on a journey in time through the whole of Middle Head's history. This is the logical site for the Centre, close to the entrance to the National Park and the historic fortifications, and with adjacent visitor car parking
2. In part of the Centre, establish a shop selling memorabilia, books and other merchandise relevant to the history of Middle Head
3. Establish a café/cafeteria style restaurant serving a range of reasonably priced food and beverages for visitors to the centre.
4. Locate veterans who have an association with Middle Head during and after WW2 to record their oral history for inclusion in the Discovery centre.
5. Liaise with the Australian War Memorial to borrow military artefacts relevant to Middle Head for use in the centre, and to assist with curating the historic journey. The AWM's Director is on record as saying the Memorial has thousands of items in storage because of limited exhibition space at the War Memorial itself. Most visitors to Sydney, particularly overseas visitors, will not include Canberra on their itinerary and would otherwise miss the opportunity which the Discovery Centre would provide to gain an understanding of this military history.
6. The Discovery Centre would lead visitors through the indigenous and military history of Middle Head in distinct segments:
 - The "first encounter"
 - Colonial military history
 - Post Colonial history to WW1

- WW1 history
 - WW2 history
 - Post WW2 history including ASOPA
7. Make safe the gun emplacements and tunnels for self guided tours
 8. Recruit veteran volunteers to run guided tours and generally assist the rangers.
 9. Establish education programmes specifically tailored to:
 - Primary school children
 - High School students
 - Further and higher education students
 10. Run paid events relevant to military history such as
 - Middle Head at night tours
 - Middle Head re-enactments (there are National Military Re-enactment Groups who run re-enactments throughout NSW)
 11. Establish a Middle Head Fund to fund stabilisation/restoration of the military infrastructure to progressively open up more of the defensive infrastructure to the public.
 12. Seek sponsorship of restoration work with major companies associated with the defence industry and relevant philanthropic organisations.

CONCLUSION

The Harbour Trust and NPWS have a common objective of increasing visitor numbers to Middle Head. The indigenous and military history of and the extensive defence infrastructure remaining on Middle and Georges Heads represent a tremendous resource to promote the whole area as an important historic precinct. The Harbour and NPWS have committed to work together to achieve a whole of Middle Head approach to the future evolution of the precinct.

There is now an opportunity to capitalise on this immense historic potential to tell the story, attract visitors and preserve the rich heritage of Middle Head for future generations.

APPENDIX B – Two examples of Corporate Support

Two examples where the concept of philanthropic support might be duplicated on Middle Head are;

The [Fairfax Track at North Head](#), which was financed by John Fairfax & Sons Limited, to mark the 150th anniversary of the first publication of the Sydney Herald

It offers superb views of Sydney Harbour and its headlands and an enjoyable, gentle walk. This 1.4km paved track starts at the end of North Head Scenic Drive and then loops around the top of North Head.

Google gives this walk a 96% rating from 71 reviews with the most spectacular views east, south and west over the harbour with the city of Sydney in the distance. It has easy motor access via North Head scenic drive with adjacent parking.

Its circuit connects three lookouts, which provide the kinds of views seen on Sydney postcards. It is ideal for families with children and is partially wheelchair accessible. It is also an exceptional walk for whale watchers during the June–July and August–October migration seasons.

Another example, the [Newcastle Memorial Walk](#), is a spectacular coastal walk which was two thirds funded by BHP Billiton.

The walk was built to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the ANZAC landing at Gallipoli in 1915 and the commencement of steel making in Newcastle. It acts as a magnificent memorial to the men and women of the Hunter who served their community and their country.

The walk features a 160 metre cliff top bridge adorned with steel silhouettes of soldiers inscribed with close to 4,000 family names of almost 11,000 known Hunter Valley men and women who enlisted during World War I. It also links to Newcastle Council's Bathers Way promenade development, a six kilometre coastal walk linking Newcastle's beaches and stretching from Merewether Ocean Baths to Nobbys Beach.

The structure cost \$4.5m to build and is a 450-meter long cliff top walkway that links Newcastle's Strzelecki Lookout to Bar Beach. BHP Billiton committed \$3million and Newcastle Council \$1.5million. It is the concept of corporate philanthropic funding that is significant.