

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS – DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE PUBLIC ADDRESSES 2

1. Reclassification Of Byron Road, Leppington To Permit Re-Opening
Of Closed Section 3

2. Establishment Of A Home Business – Beauty Salon, No 33 (Lot
1679 DP 1027869) James Bailey Drive, Harrington Park..... 5

3. Statement of Joint Intent (SOJI) for Integrated Environmental
Management – Hawkesbury Nepean River System..... 13

4. Companion Animals – Nuisance Order, 8 Watkins Crescent,
Currans Hill 19

5. Rezoning Application (Land generally to the North of “Spring Hill”
Village) Currans Hill – Lot 466 DP1017742 (Previously Lot 576, DP
1007061) owned by Wolin/Landco Joint Venture; Lots 34, 36, 37 &
38 DP 28024, Lots 352 & 351 DP 809159 owned by Byrne,
Zammit, Bonello/Jelenkovic, Radovac & Driver;..... 20

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

Present: Cr S Winn (Deputy Mayor/Chairperson), Cr G Corrigan, Cr B Batros, Cr S Fekete, Cr N McFadden, Cr F Anderson, Cr C Patterson, Cr S Senise.

Staff: General Manager, Director Governance & Outcomes, Director Works & Services, Director Development & Environment, Manager Outcomes, Manager Development, Manager Environment & Health, Administration Officer.

Apology: An apology was received from Cr E Campbell from this meeting.

Resolved on the Motion of Cr Anderson, seconded Cr Senise that leave of absence be granted to Cr Campbell for this meeting.

DC043/02 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE PUBLIC ADDRESSES

Mr Gary Rhodes addressed the Committee in relation to Item 5.
Mr David Brown addressed the Committee in relation to Item 5.

MOTION

Moved Cr Senise, seconded Cr McFadden that Mr McGann address the Committee in relation to Item 2

DC044/02 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**

MOTION

Moved Cr Batros, seconded Cr Senise that Mr Driver address the Committee in relation to Item 5.

DC045/02 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**

MOTION

Moved Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr Batros that Mr Lord address the Committee in relation to Item 2

DC046/02 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

**1. Reclassification Of Byron Road, Leppington To Permit
Re-Opening Of Closed Section**

File No: **TC3277/3** (Director, Development &
Environment Division)

Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the outcome of a recent public exhibition of a draft amending LEP No 126 to reclassify No 66A (Lot 1 DP 822334) Byron Road, Leppington as “Operational Land”. [Refer to **Tabled Document “DC 1”**]

Background

At the meeting of 12 June 2001, Council considered a report regarding the re-opening of Byron Road, Leppington. The report informed Council of the results of an investigation carried out into the reopening proposal and outlined the actions required to effect the proposed road reopening. A previous report to Council detailed that the majority of the community supported the reopening of Byron Road, subject to the implementation of safety controls to minimise the risk to reserve patrons.

At the 12 June 2001 meeting, Council resolved to “reclassify Lot 1 DP 822334 (No 66A) Byron Road, Leppington as “Operational Land” by way of a Local Environmental Plan and upon completion dedicate the land as public road under section 10 of the Roads Act 1993.”

Main Report

An amending LEP (to amend LEP 48) was prepared and forwarded to PlanningNSW advising them of the decision to prepare the plan. Council subsequently enacted its delegations pursuant to Section 65(1) of the EPA&A and directed that the draft plan be exhibited in accordance with section 66 of the Act.

The draft LEP was exhibited for the period 11 March 2002 to 8 April 2002. At the close of the exhibition period no submissions were received.

Accordingly the draft plan is now before Council for adoption.

Recommended: That:

- (i) Draft Camden Local Environmental Plan No 126 be adopted by Council to reclassify Lot 1 DP 822334 (No 66A) Byron Road, Leppington to operational land.
- (ii) The draft plan be forwarded to PlanningNSW for gazettal.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

- (iii) Council resolve that upon gazettal of the plan that the land be dedicated as public road under section 10 of the Roads Act 1993.

Resolved on the Motion of Cr Fekete, seconded Cr Patterson that:

- (i) *Draft Camden Local Environmental Plan No 126 be adopted by Council to reclassify Lot 1 DP 822334 (No 66A) Byron Road, Leppington to operational land.*
- (ii) *The draft plan be forwarded to PlanningNSW for gazettal.*
- (iii) *Council resolve that upon gazettal of the plan that the land be dedicated as public road under section 10 of the Roads Act 1993.*

DC047/02 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED**.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

2. Establishment Of A Home Business – Beauty Salon, No 33 (Lot 1679 DP 1027869) James Bailey Drive, Harrington Park

File No: 4337.330-3 (Director, Development & Environment Division)
DA No: 146/2002
Owner: Mr GP Morgan & Ms KS Bailey
Zoning: Residential 2 [d] pursuant to LEP 74.

Purpose of Report

The applicant seeks approval to establish a home business. The proposed development in its original form received considerable objection from the adjoining property owners. The applicant subsequently modified the proposal to address the concerns of the neighbours. Council has received three submissions to the latest proposal as a consequence of the re-notification process. A locality plan of the site forms **Tabled Document “DC 2”**.

Summary of Recommendation

It is recommended that the application be approved for an initial trial period of 12 months. The trial period will allow Council to gauge the appropriateness of the development and determine whether the home business should be allowed to continue indefinitely or for a further trial period following the submission of a further development application.

Background

Council received an application to establish a home business in the garage area of the existing residence with a shop front entry. At approximately the same time a separate application was lodged for additions to the rear of the existing residence in the form of a two dwelling development. As a result of negotiations between Council staff and the applicant, the original plans have been amended. It is now proposed to locate the salon in the additions proposed for the rear of the dwelling.

The proposed two dwelling development complies with Council’s various development standards and DCP provisions. The separate application has not been determined, however, given that refusal of the proposed home business may necessitate changes to the overall design [ie removal of the salon and waiting area].

The Proposal

The application in its original form sought to convert one half of the existing double garage for the purposes of establishing a

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

beauty salon. Council held concerns with respect to this proposal in term of the reduction in available off street parking. The adjoining property owners also shared this concern.

The applicant has subsequently amended the development proposal by relocating the salon. The salon will now be located in the additions proposed at the rear of the property [refer to **Tabled Document “DC 3”**]. The amended proposal will permit the retention of two off-street parking spaces for the residents [in the existing double garage] and provide two spaces for clientele [in front of the double garage]. The applicant intends to fix a small sign to the garage area directing customs to the salon at the rear of the property. An additional car parking space will also be available to the rear yard area for the resident’s use.

The resident of the house will be the sole operator of the business. The salon will operate by appointment only and will serve only one client at a time. Approximately 6-10 clients will be treated per day. The applicant does not intend to operate on Sunday, Monday and Public Holidays. On weeknights the development is proposed to operate to 6pm and 8pm on Thursdays. On Saturday the salon will be open between 8am and 1pm. The services provided relate to skin treatments, manicures, pedicures, hair removal etc. It is the applicant’s goal to ‘provide local residents with a professional, quiet, relaxed atmosphere where they can indulge in the best of beauty therapy serviced by a fully qualified therapist’.

Notification

As suggested elsewhere in this report the proposed development has been notified twice. Once in its original form and again in its amended form. As a consequence of the initial notification exercise, Council received two submissions. A further five written submissions where received via the estate developers [Harpak]. One of these submissions was in the form of a petition with 12 signatures. The following concerns were raised in the above submissions:

- (a) The impacts associated with additional demand for street parking and associated traffic movements.
- (b) The level of noise generated by the ‘coming and going of clientele’.
- (c) The impact on the residential area caused by outdoor advertising.
- (d) The impact on the residential area caused by the proposed shopfront entry to the garage.
- (e) The potential impacts caused by the volume of trade and operating hours.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

- (f) The proposed development is inconsistent with the terms of the 88b Restriction to User applicable to property owners in the area.

As a result of the second notification exercise Council received three submissions. The concerns related to points (a), (b) and (e) mentioned above.

Copies of all submissions have been forwarded to Council separately with the Business Paper.

Planning Controls

Consideration has been given to the following documents in relation to the assessment of this application.

- Camden Local Environmental Plan No 47
- Development Control Plan No 92 – Guidelines for Home Businesses
- Development Control Plan No 58 – Residential Code
- Camden 2025

Assessment

The following points are made with respect to the assessment carried out in accordance with section 79C of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act*.

- [a] the provisions of any planning instrument, draft planning instrument, development control plan or any matter prescribed by the regulations**

Camden LEP 74

The subject property is zoned Residential 2 [d] pursuant to Camden LEP 74. Home business is a permitted use with the consent of Council. The proposed development generally complies with the definition of home business contained in the planning instrument with the exception of operating hours on Thursday nights. The LEP also has provisions for certain home businesses (home offices) to be exempt from the need to obtain development consent where there is no impact in terms of traffic generation and noise on adjoining properties. This development would not fall within this definition on the basis of traffic generation. The LEP seeks to:

- (i) ‘allow people to carry out a reasonable range of activities from their homes, where such activities are not likely to affect the living environment of neighbours’.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

However, considerable objection to the development has been received from neighbouring property owners. The validity of these objections is discussed elsewhere in this report.

Development Control Plan No 92 – Guidelines for Home Businesses

The proposed development complies with the various DCP objectives and provisions. It should be noted that the planning instrument permits the employment of an additional staff member who does not reside at the premises. The applicant has agreed to restrict the number of persons who work at the salon to one, that being herself. The development is not expected to interfere with the amenity of the area through the 'emission of noise, vibration, smell, fumes etc'. However, in respect of hours of operation, the applicant has requested to operate until 8pm one day per week (Thursdays). This does not comply with the hours of operation required by the DCP guidelines. Given that the recommendation is for a 12 month trial period, it is considered that this time is acceptable and should concerns arise with the development within this period, then the matter can be reviewed when a further development application is submitted to extend the consent.

Development Control Plan No 58 – Residential Code

As previously suggested the salon will be located in additions proposed for the rear yard, which has been lodged, as a separate application. The proposed additions constitute 'two-dwelling development' which has been assessed and found to comply with the various objectives and provisions contained in DCP 58.

Camden 2025

The strategic document envisages a Camden 'which has achieved a broad range of opportunities for a prosperous and complete lifestyle'. The document suggests that 'Council has a responsibility in managing its processes to facilitate appropriate economic activity to generate local jobs'. The proposed development will provide the applicant with an opportunity to live and work in the Camden area. The impacts upon the community are not expected to be significant in terms of the demand placed upon services or loss of residential amenity.

[b] likely impact on the natural and built environment

The proposed additions to the dwelling are single storey in nature. An existing side boundary fence [1.8m high] will ensure that the additions are well screened when viewed from the street. The site is fully serviced. Consequently the beauty salon is not expected to have a detrimental effect upon the environment. A condition could be imposed upon any consent granted relating to noise abatement to ensure that all activities carried out on site do not affect the enjoyment of adjoining properties.

[c] the suitability of the site

The property benefits from dual street frontages and this arrangement lends itself to the type of development proposed by the applicant. A total of three [3] car parking spaces will be provided on site for use by the residents. An additional two [2] spaces will be provided in front of the existing double garage for use by clientele. The development will not result in the removal of any trees. Minor alteration to the natural landform is required to permit a level area for the third residential car parking area.

[d] any submissions made

The following comments are provided with respect to the matters raised by adjoining property owners.

(i) Traffic generation

Based upon the number of clientele to be treated on a daily basis, the development is expected to generate a maximum of 20 extra vehicle movements per day. It should be noted that the salon operates by appointment only consequently there will not be any 'peak demand' as such. The number of traffic movements may be reduced if local clientele [ie residents of Harrington Park] walk to the salon for their appointment.

(ii) Noise generation

Reference has been made to the noise generated by the 'coming and going of clientele'. It is envisaged that this concern relates to noise caused by vehicle engines, opening and closing of vehicle doors and any conversations. The degree of noise generated by these activities however, is

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

not expected to be excessive. The applicant has indicated that the services provided do not involve any noise generating equipment. Background music will be played, which the applicant described as 'sounds of the forest and dolphins'.

(iii) Outdoor advertising

Development Control Plan No 92 – Guidelines for Home Business permits the erection of a business identification sign with an area of no greater than 0.72m². A condition can be imposed upon the consent relating to this requirement.

(iv) Shop front garage entry

The proposed 'shop front' alterations to the garage area have been superseded by the latest proposal. The salon is now proposed to be located within the additions to be constructed at the rear of the property. The existing double garage will be retained in its original form.

(v) Volume of trade

The applicant predicts that the salon will treat between 6 and 10 clients per day. While it may be difficult to regulate the volume of trade, it is intended to condition the hours of operation as described above. It is also intended to condition the consent with respect to the applicant being the sole beauty therapist associated with the business. That is the consent will prohibit the employment of an additional staff member. The applicant has agreed to this condition.

(vi) Restrictive covenant

The subject property is affected by an 88b Restriction to User imposed by the developer of the subdivision and not the Council. The restriction prohibits the establishment of a home business without the prior approval of the estate developers. In this case the developer is Harpak. It is understood, in discussions with the developer, that no objection is raised to the establishment of the business as proposed. It should be noted however, that the prohibition contained in the covenant is a 'private' restriction or provision, which binds the property owners. Enforcement of the restriction is not Council's role in this case. The onus with respect to

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

enforcement of the covenant rests with the persons that benefit from the restriction, in this case the owners of the adjoining properties. It should also be pointed out that clause 21 of Camden LEP 74 states that certain laws established by way of 'agreement, covenant or similar instrument' shall not apply to Council's assessment of a development.

Conclusion

The applicant has altered the original proposal to address the concerns held by Council and the adjoining property owners. The latest proposal is more beneficial in terms of car parking spaces for the residents and clientele. Council expects the development to proceed with little impact upon the amenity of the area. A trial period of 12 months will however, allow Council to consult the community further and gauge the appropriateness of the development. Should Council deem that the development is inappropriate, then the extensions could be converted to a two-dwelling development.

Recommended: That:

- (i) Development Application No 3/2002 for establishment of a home business at No 33 James Bailey Drive, Harrington Park be approved with conditions for an initial trial period of 12 months [refer to **Tabled Document "DC 4"**.
- (ii) A separate application be required if the applicant wishes to continue trading beyond the trial period so that the community can continue to be consulted on the appropriateness of the development.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

MOTION

Moved Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr Batros, that Standing Orders be suspended to permit Mr Lord to address the Committee in relation to Item 2.

DC048/02

THE MOTION ON BEING PUT WAS **CARRIED**.

(Mr Lord then addressed the Committee in relation to Item 2 – the time being 5.55pm).

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

RESUMPTION OF STANDING ORDERS

MOTION

Moved Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr Batros, that Standing Orders be resumed.

DC049/02 THE MOTION ON BEING PUT WAS **CARRIED**.

(The Standing Orders resumed – the time being 5.59pm)

MOTION

Moved Cr McFadden, seconded Cr Senise that:

- (i) Development Application No 3/2002 for establishment of a home business at No 33 James Bailey Drive, Harrington Park be approved with conditions for an initial trial period of 12 months [refer to **Tabled Document “DC 4”**.
- (ii) A separate application be required if the applicant wishes to continue trading beyond the trial period so that the community can continue to be consulted on the appropriateness of the development.

THE MOTION ON BEING PUT WAS **LOST**.

(Crs Corrigan, Patterson, Anderson, Batros, Fekete & Winn voted against the Motion).

FURTHER MOTION

Moved Cr Batros, seconded Cr Corrigan that the Development Application not be approved as it is not in accordance with the operating hours in the Council Policy and not as set out in the Section 88B Instrument and may set a precedent in Harrington Park”.

DC050/02 THE FURTHER MOTION ON BEING PUT WAS **CARRIED**.

(Cr McFadden & Cr Senise voted against the Motion).

**3. Statement of Joint Intent (SOJI) for Integrated
Environmental Management – Hawkesbury Nepean
River System**

File No: TC4236 (Director, Development & Environment
Division)

Purpose of Report

To advise Council of the State Government's response to the Healthy Rivers Commission Inquiry into the Hawkesbury Nepean River system and to highlight, where known, the implications for Council in the Statement of Joint Intent (SOJI).

Background

The NSW Healthy Rivers Commission conducted a public inquiry in to the health of the Hawkesbury Nepean River system from 1997 to 1999.

The findings and recommendations of the enquiry were reported in August 1998 in the Final Report of the Independent Inquiry into the Hawkesbury Nepean River System and in April 1999 in the Hawkesbury Nepean River System Supplementary Report.

Main Report

In March 2001, the State Government issued a Statement of Joint Intent (SOJI) for management of the Hawkesbury Nepean River System in response to the Final Reports of the Healthy Rivers Commission.

A copy of the SOJI forms **Tabled Document "DC 5"**.

The State Government approved strategies for river health are categorised in the SOJI as follows:

- (a) Regional Environmental Planning
- (b) Environmental management by councils
- (c) Riverine Corridor Protection
- (d) Water Management
- (e) Extractive Industry
- (f) Data Management

A circular issued by the Department of Local Government (DLG) in December 2001 states:

"The SOJI represents a binding commitment by State agencies and authorities to adopt an integrated management approach to information sharing and specific action on the approved management strategies. The approved strategies include some

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

actions for which the 26 councils in the catchment area have primary or supplementary responsibility. The SOJI does not bind the councils directly, but council actions will be independently audited by the Healthy Rivers Commission". (The method of auditing is still to be determined.)

The following is intended to provide a commentary on the SOJI and to highlight areas of the SOJI that require Council action or participation;

(a) Regional Environmental Planning

The main outcome sought from the implementation of these strategies will be to establish an integrated planning framework for the catchment to facilitate decision making from a system based point of view of the catchment.

The 'Lead Responsibility' from the SOJI, for these strategies is divided between PlanningNSW, DLWC and the EPA. Council will be jointly responsible for contributing to the implementation of the new Sydney Catchment Regional Environmental Plan (REP). This includes;

- taking into account the findings and recommendations of the Healthy Rivers Commission
- adopting for planning purposes water quality objectives
- incorporating an integrated approach to stormwater management across the catchment
- require new developments to demonstrate that they can sustainably manage effluent

The Sydney Catchments REP is being developed by PlanningNSW.

(b) Environmental Management by Councils

The main outcome sought from the strategies under this category is the strengthening of the environmental management component of Council Management Plans. The focus of these strategies is on state agencies to provide greater support to councils in the development of management plans.

The 'Lead responsibility' of these strategies falls with the DLG. The EPA, PlanningNSW, DLWC and NSW Agriculture will be jointly responsible for supporting development of the environmental components of management plans and sewage management plans.

- assist in the development of the environmental management component of Council's Management plan

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

The DLG has requested that councils in the Hawkesbury Nepean catchment review their current management plans and ensure that an integrated environmental statement is included in the 2002/03 management plan and incorporated into any associated evaluation, strategic and operational reviews and objective setting processes.

This is a request for Councils to consider and to adopt integrated environmental management objectives for their local areas. The objectives should reflect local circumstances, be consistent with the council's charter and provide sufficient specificity for program direction and ongoing performance evaluation.

Camden Council's Strategic Plan 2025, Management Plan and State of the Environment Reports address environmental systems. It is intended that Council Officers will review the Management Plan for 2002/03 in light of the request and make adjustments if required.

The Department of Local Government has suggested that the draft Management plan be referred to the state government agencies that are party to the SOJI for comment. This will meet the requirements of strategy 2.1 'State agency assistance to Councils'.

- provision of advice and technical support to councils in the development of sewage management plans

This strategy has commenced and is ongoing. Council Officers are preparing a Draft Sewage Management Strategy for Camden. Council staff also participates in 'Hawkesbury Nepean on-site Wastewater Group', a forum of state government agencies, local government and private entities formed to work through issues relating to on site sewerage management.

The DLG has supported councils by introducing a program titled 'Septic Safe' which provided initial financial assistance to Council for the implementation of an on-site sewage management program (Inspections and strategy formulation) and ongoing technical advice.

- encouraging councils to raise special environmental levies where necessary to implement the Healthy Rivers Commission's recommendations

The Department of Local Government has undertaken a change in assessment procedures for special variations to rate increases for environmental services. Evidence based proposals linked to performance objectives from Management Plans and State of the Environment Reports, with planned evaluation processes will be considered for approval.

(c) Riverine Corridor Protection

The main outcome sought from implementation of this strategy is to require all levels of the decision-making processes governing development to explicitly address the need for protection of riverine corridors so that rivers and streams can fulfil their full range of ecological functions, as well as drainage.

The 'Lead Responsibility' of this will fall with PlanningNSW who are to develop a State Riverine Corridor Policy, with all agencies participating in the SOJI being jointly responsible for its implementation.

(d) River Flow Management

The strategies under this heading include;

- water allocation
- measurement of water use
- river management forum
- review of Nepean weirs
- integrated effluent management strategy
- integrated water quality and river flow management
- managing the Impacts of Mining on River Flow and Health

The lead responsibilities for these strategies fall with DLWC and the EPA.

(e) Extractive Industry

These strategies are designed to establish a framework which addresses the needs of Sydney's construction industry whilst protecting rivers and their estuaries from the adverse effects of extraction, especially that carried out in stream.

Planning NSW will be leading the strategies for this section

(f) Data Management

The main outcome sought from the implementation of these strategies is to ensure public access to data collected relating to the health of the Hawkesbury Nepean River System. It is sought to improve the arrangements for recording and collating all the information gathered on the river system, which in turn will facilitate the provision of public access to the data.

The establishment of an Integrated Water Monitoring Framework (IWMF) for the Hawkesbury Nepean River System is well under way. The Framework facilitates and coordinates collaboration and information sharing in water monitoring in

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

the Catchment. The benefits of the program for Council include;

- access to other water monitoring data
- improvements in data handling and monitoring protocols
- training needs to be identified to meet future requirements in monitoring
- cost savings in environmental monitoring
- better links of monitoring to management planning
- coordinated and consistent approaches to State of the Environment reporting

During this summer season Council has participated in the 'Recreational Water Assessment and Management Program (RWAMP)', a component of the IWWMF. The Nepean River at Belgenny Reserve is sampled as part of the program. This sampling complements Council's routine water sampling program.

Implementation

The government has established the 'Water CEO Committee' for the oversighting of Agency and Council responses. The members of this committee comprise the Chief Executive Officers of the EPA, DLWC, PlanningNSW, NSW Agriculture, NSW Fisheries, and NPWS. It also includes members of The Cabinet Office and NSW Treasury.

It is intended that an independent review of the implementation of Agency and Council responsibilities, against the framework provided by the SOJI, be undertaken within two years of the date of the document.

'The Draft Catchment Blueprint for the Hawkesbury Nepean' is a plan for sustainable management of our natural resources. The Blueprint builds on, and incorporates, a number of the strategies of the SOJI. Once the Blueprint is finalised strategies will be developed for implementation. It is envisaged that many of these strategies will complement the SOJI strategies.

Conclusion

The Statement of Joint Intent for the Hawkesbury Nepean River System is a record of state agency and council commitments to implement the endorsed recommendations of the Healthy Rivers Commission.

Council is implementing some of the strategies outlined in the SOJI and components are incorporated in the Management Plan. Council appears on track for several aspects of SOJI, for instance;

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

- implementation of the stormwater management plan
- on-site sewage management program
- participation in the 'Recreational Water Assessment and Management program(RWAMP)' a component of the Integrated Water Monitoring Framework (IWQF)

The full ramifications for Camden Council and local government in general, of the SOJI are not clear and are still unfolding. However, in general the integrated environmental management approach of the SOJI is considered reasonable, and should deliver positive catchment outcomes.

Recommended: That Council notes and supports the Statement of Joint Intent for the Hawkesbury Nepean River System.

Resolved on the Motion of Cr Fekete, seconded Cr McFadden that Council notes and supports the Statement of Joint Intent for the Hawkesbury Nepean River System.

DC051/02 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

4. Companion Animals – Nuisance Order, 8 Watkins Crescent, Currans Hill

File No: (PF8038.60) (Director, Development & Environment Division)

Purpose of the Report

To recommend that Council resolve to withdraw legal proceedings against the occupants of the premises located at 8 Watkins Crescent, Currans Hill for a breach of a Nuisance Order (regarding barking of dogs) of Section 21(2) of the Companion Animals Act 1998.

Background

At Council meeting held on 29 January 2002, Council resolved to commence legal proceedings against the occupants of 8 Watkins Crescent, Currans Hill in relation to alleged nuisance barking. On 3 March 2002, Council received correspondence from the occupants advising that they had had their dogs de-barked by a veterinarian in an effort to stop the ongoing problem and veterinary certificates were produced.

Current Situation

Council Officers have since been in contact with all potential witnesses in this matter who advise that the barking has significantly decreased to such a point where it is barely noticeable and they are happy for the matter to proceed no further.

Summons in respect of this matter have not been issued and legal costs to Council at this stage will be minimal.

Summary

Sufficient evidence has been collected to prove a prima facie case before the Local Court however as this matter has been successfully resolved it would be of little benefit to the community at large to continue prosecution.

Recommended: That Council withdraw legal proceedings against the occupants of 8 Watkins Crescent, Currans Hill.

Resolved on the Motion of Cr Batros, seconded Cr Senise that Council withdraw legal proceedings against the occupants of 8 Watkins Crescent, Currans Hill.

DC052/02 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED**.

5. Rezoning Application (Land generally to the North of “Spring Hill” Village) Currans Hill – Lot 466 DP1017742 (Previously Lot 576, DP 1007061) owned by Wolin/Landco Joint Venture; Lots 34, 36, 37 & 38 DP 28024, Lots 352 & 351 DP 809159 owned by Byrne, Zammit, Bonello/Jelenkovic, Radovac & Driver;

(Director Governance & Outcomes) (File 4412/4)

Purpose of the Report

This report seeks Council’s resolution to publicly exhibit a Local Environmental Study (LES) and supporting technical studies, as well as a draft Local Environmental Plan (LEP) to rezone the subject land (Wolin/Landco Joint Venture) for urban and “urban edge” (rural residential) purposes and to defer the rezoning of land in the ownership of Driver and others. (An **Executive Summary of the LES** has been **issued to Councillors under separate cover**, whilst the DLEP is shown as **Tabled Document “DC 6”**).

Ownership Pattern and Staged Rezoning

The majority of the land is in the ownership of the Wolin/Landco Joint Venture Group. The western end of the land is in the ownership of a group of smaller landholders (referred to as the Driver Group). The preferred position was to exhibit two separate but complementary Master Plans indicating the likely pattern of development, concurrently with the draft LEP.

The consideration of the Wolin/Landco rezoning and Master Plan had been delayed to allow concurrent consideration of a Driver Group Master Plan. However the Master Plan for the Driver Group has not yet reached a satisfactory level of resolution. Nevertheless it is clear, from that which has been submitted by the Driver Group, that the Wolin/Landco Master Plan makes adequate provision (e.g. drainage and road connections) to enable orderly and economic development of the Driver Group land, should Council so decide.

Background

At its development committee meeting of 23 October 2000, Council considered an application to rezone land generally to the north of “Spring Hill Village”, Currans Hill (commonly known now as Manooka Valley) for urban purposes. The application was submitted by Landco Developments on behalf of the Landco Holdings/Wolin Investments joint venture. The application also “flagged” the prospect of the rezoning of

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

adjoining land to the west within the same visual catchment (the Driver Group).

At that meeting Council resolved to prepare a Local Environment Study (LES) and Draft Local Environment Plan (DLEP) for the Wolin/Landco Joint Venture's land and certain properties to the west. The purpose of undertaking an LES was to ensure the land is suitable for rezoning as urban and urban edge residential development.

In December 2000, DUAP's Housing and Land Supply Sub-Committee resolved to include the land on the Urban Development Program (UDP). Council was formally advised that the land was placed on the Urban Development Program by the Minister for Urban Affairs and Planning by letter of 8 May 2001.

Land the Subject of the Rezoning Proposal

The plan reproduced as **Tabled Document "DC 7"** identifies land which is the subject of the draft LEP.

The land, which is the subject of this draft LEP, consists of Lot 466 DP1017742 (previously Lot 576 DP 1007061 referred to as the Wolin/Landco Joint Venture land), Lots 34, 36 37 and 38 DP 28024, and Lots 351 & 352 DP 809159 (referred to as the Driver Group land). The subject land is bounded by Turner Road and the boundary of "Spring Hill Village" to the south, by St. Gregory's Agricultural College and private properties to the north and west. A portion of the site extends south to the Christian Life Centre along the eastern boundary of "Spring Hill Village".

The Wolin/Landco Joint Venture holding is some 56.18 hectares in size whilst adjoining land to the Driver Group land to the immediate west is some 19.64 hectares in size, with the total study area being 75.82 hectares. It should be noted that although the western part of the study area includes 6 properties west of the Wolin/Landco Joint Venture holding, a prominent ridge and steep slopes significantly reduce the amount of land likely to be suitable for urban purposes.

An easement for major electricity transmission lines traverses the eastern side of the subject land in a generally north-south direction. Another lower voltage electricity easement runs north/south along the western boundary of the Joint Venture's land. The Sydney Water supply channel runs in a generally north-south direction near the eastern boundary of the land, below Badgally Hill.

The land is gently undulating rising from around RL 100 in the southwest to RL 147.8 metres in the northeast and RL 122 in

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

the northwest. Except for hilltops, the higher ground is increasingly steep approaching 20% gradient. Three streams nominated by the Department of Land and Water Conservation as 'rivers' under the Rivers and Foreshores Improvement Act traverse the site. One runs across the north-west corner of the Wolin/Landco land then generally north to south through Driver's land, and two run from north east to south west and from east to west through the Wolin/Landco Joint Venture's land.

The site has been used for farming and cattle grazing for over 100 years and has generally been cleared of native vegetation, except for:

- (i) Remnant riparian vegetation on both the Wolin/Landco land and the Driver Group land;
- (ii) An area of scattered eucalypts on the southern portion of the Wolin/Landco land; and
- (iii) A substantial area of woodland (significantly weed affected) in the steeper northeastern corner of the land, which adjoins Badgally Hill.

Camden Strategic Plan & Structure Plan

Camden 2025 – A Strategic Plan for Camden, which was adopted by Council on 13 December 1999 sets goals for the local government area until 2025. The proposed rezoning is consistent with plan objectives regarding:

- Managing Urban Growth
- Accessibility
- Environmental Systems
- Economic & Community Development and
- Governance

The *Camden Structure Plan* was adopted by Council on 24 July 2000. The aim of the Structure Plan is to '*... provide a planning framework to the year 2025 which preserves Camden's unique characteristics while accommodating urban growth.*'

The Structure Plan identifies an area north of Currans Hill as potentially suitable for urban expansion. The proposed rezoning considers this in detail. The Structure Plan exercise was, however, not sufficiently detailed to identify the nature and extent of urban development opportunities.

Existing Zoning

The relevant Local Environmental Plan for the land is presently LEP No.48. The existing zoning of the Joint Venture land is "Environmental Protection 7(d) Scenic" and the zoning of the Driver Group land is Rural (1b) (2 Hectares). Adjoining land to the south is zoned Residential 2(d) (Release Areas) Zone pursuant to LEP No. 47.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

Environmental Investigations

A series of detailed background studies, which focus upon the principal environmental considerations, were commissioned. Preliminary studies originally related only to the Joint Venture land but were finalised to cover the whole of the land consistent with Council's resolution. These studies include:

- Flora & Fauna – LesryK Environmental Consultants
- Landscape & Visual Analysis – HLA/Lindy Lean, Landscape Architects
- Archaeological – Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management
- Geotechnical – Douglas Partners
- Traffic – Stapleton Consulting
- Services – Young Consulting Engineers
- Water Quality Management – Storm Consulting

These background studies have been the subject of detailed review by Council's staff and consultant and have been the subject of staff workshops in respect of the Wolin/Landco land. Comment on the studies is provided in **Tabled Document "DC 8"**. The Driver Group land has more recently been the subject of separate submissions principally from town planning consultants, Rhodes Haskew Associates (see below).

It should be noted that in respect of contamination preliminary investigations and reporting generally conclude that the current and previous site usage presents a low risk of soil/groundwater contamination, although there are localised areas, e.g. the former orchard and filled areas, which may have residual risk, due to former use of pesticides or imported filling. Further, there is a low risk of contamination on site.

Driver Group Submissions

In addition submissions have been received from Rhodes Haskew Associates acting on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. J. Driver and others. These submissions consist of: a letter from Conacher Travers Environmental Consultants regarding threatened species, hydrology and vegetation; a Tree Survey Plan; a Subdivision Concept Plan; engineering assessment and design in respect of hydraulic considerations and the treatment of the watercourse relative to stormwater control; and a planning submission.

Council officers and officers of DLWC visited the Driver Group land on 6 February 2002 and a revised indicative Subdivision Concept Plan was submitted.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

The Rhodes Haskew submission comments specifically on the Flora & Fauna and Landscape & Visual Analysis studies. Regarding Flora & Fauna the comments reject the extent and location of land proposed as 7(d1) and & 7(d2) i.e. “fauna corridor” land.

In respect of the engineering assessment and design, and the indicative subdivision plan it is considered that the engineering design and the indicative relationship of likely future allotments to the proposed open space is unsatisfactory. It is also noted that land above RL 112 within the Driver Group holding requires deferral pending formal advice from Sydney Water as to its ability to provide water supply to the land above RL 112.

It is therefore considered that the Master Plan and rezoning for the Driver Group land should be deferred and, if rezoning proceeds, future development of this land should be subject to an approved Master Plan before any development application is determined.

Subject to the above comments, it is considered that there is sufficient information before Council to exhibit a draft LEP for all of the land which was subject to Council’s resolution and which was placed on the Urban Development Program by the Minister.

Proposed Zonings

The zoning arrangement proposed provides a broad but satisfactory framework for public exhibition. Provisions of LEP 47 permit some flexibility in zone boundary location. Owners of the Driver Group land to the west of the Joint Venture land have provided a master plan indicating a potential road arrangement for the land. The Master Plan is not sufficiently advanced to constitute a development application. Hence it is unsuitable for exhibition with the LES and draft LEP as an indication of a possible development scenario. However it does confirm that the Wolin/Landco Master Plan makes adequate provision for integration and possible future development of the Driver Group land.

It is considered that it would be unreasonable to further delay the Wolin/Landco proposal. Therefore, to allow matters to progress, it is desirable to exhibit zonings for the Driver Group land but not precincts and a road pattern, as these have not reached a satisfactory level of resolution. If at the end of the public exhibition Council is unsatisfied with the information before it, Council would have the option to proceed to rezone only the Wolin/Landco Joint Venture land and to defer the Driver Group land pending a satisfactory resolution of outstanding issues. Alternately Council could resolve to

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

proceed with the whole rezoning but to add a clause to the LEP requiring that a Council approved Master Plan be in place before any development application can be determined on the Driver Group land.

Consultation

In the preparation of the local environmental study and draft local environmental plan, consultation in accordance with Section 62 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 was carried out with relevant authorities and Campbelltown Council. Appropriate responses to allow progress have been received.

Regulatory Approach

The LES proposes a “place based” planning and regulatory approach to achieve significant improvements in the built environment and the approval processes. Proposed principles are:

- Statutory instruments based on “place-making” rather than “one size fits all” legal, administrative and assessment practices
- A seamless transition between the LEP for the area, a development Master Plan and Design Guidelines for Manooka Valley. The Master Plan, and subsequent 88B instrument restrictions on title would provide for additional clarity and avoid discontinuity in interpretation.

The proposed statutory model for developing the land is:

- Local Environmental Plan as a site specific and “place based” document containing major elements of the Design Guidelines.
- Master Plan development application (Stage 1 DA) supported by Design Guidelines.

The series of Design Guidelines would include: Regulating Plan (lot & dwelling types), Urban & Rural Regulations (dwelling envelopes), Street Types (carriageway & verge widths, kerb conditions, visitor parking, service locations & street trees), landscape standards and building standards (roof pitch, materials, window treatment, verandah & other details).

The planning framework for Manooka Valley has been developed in a site specific way to respond to the unique qualities of the upper Narellan Creek catchment, yet consistent with metropolitan planning policy and the requirements of Draft SEPP 66 – Integration of Land Use and Transport i.e. with the underlying aim of achieving a nett 15 dwellings per hectare.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

The intention is to deliver the urban outcomes described in the Desired Future Character statement and to move towards collapsing the typical sequential planning approach and exhibit the Master Plan and Design Guidelines at the same time as the draft LEP. This should provide a clearer indication of outcomes at an earlier stage and reflect a shift from traditional zone-driven development to the “place management approach” being embraced by Council.

LEP Format

The draft LEP **Tabled Document “DC 6”** proposes to amend LEP 47 to include the subject site within its boundaries.

Primary objectives of the plan aim to achieve the following outcomes:

- Development that responds positively to the area’s unique attributes (remnant bushland, scenic quality, location on rural/urban fringe)
- Preservation of remnant Cumberland Plain Woodland
- Provision for an efficient public transport system to be implemented
- Provision of an appropriate physical and visual interface between Spring Hill Village and adjoining rural areas.
- Demonstration of environmentally sustainable development

The draft LEP creates two new zones – 2(d1) (Residential “D1” (Manooka Valley) Zone) and 7(d2) (Environment Protection (Woodland) Zone).

Manooka Valley Zone

The creation of the 2(d1) Manooka Valley Zone allows Special Provisions to be applied to the subject site which deal with:

- Desired Future Character
- Fences & Walls
- Roads & Paths
- Private Open Space
- Landscaped Open Space
- Revegetation of Urban Edge
- Development on Sloping Land
- Privacy
- Conservation of Energy
- Car Parking
- Management of Rainwater
- Density
- Built Form

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

The draft LEP also identifies site-specific variations to exempt and complying development provisions specifically for the subject site.

The provisions provide a greater level of certainty as to the outcomes at Manooka Valley and elevate to statutory weight matters such as: amount and quality of private open space; quality of landscaped open space; car parking; provision of rainwater tanks; dwelling density (on a street block by street block basis); and building character (height, roof and verandah pitch).

Regarding the Wolin/Landco land, lot sizes implicit in the dwelling densities may be a minimum of 180 square metres. It is proposed to allow second dwelling development on lots to a minimum of 325 square metres. While these lot sizes are below the standards normally applicable in DCP 58, they are part of a master planned development which aims for a mix of allotments including 500m² to urban edge 1000m² (min) together with the smaller village common allotments and the like creating an appropriate balance of lot sizes which best achieves the State Government target of 15 dwellings per hectare.

Because of the unsatisfactory degree of resolution of the Driver Group Master Plan, sheet 2 of the LEP maps does not extend the precinct designations outside of the Joint Venture land, Therefore some of these provisions – such as Car Parking and Density presently would relate only to Wolin/Landco Joint Venture land.

This can be remedied when the Driver Group land is made subject to an agreed layout (“deferred zoning” scenario) or when a Master Plan is adopted by Council for the land (“no development determination without master plan” scenario). Nevertheless provisions relating to Fences & Walls, Private Open Space, Landscaped Open Space, Development on Sloping Land, Privacy, Conservation of Energy & Water, Management of Rainwater and Built Form would apply to the whole of the land.

The highly prescriptive nature of the controls largely determines the subdivision pattern and hence the development yield of the land. The development outcome is effectively determined by and given statutory weight through the form of Local Environmental Plan proposed.

Environmental Protection Zones

The draft LEP proposes two Environmental Protection zones – the existing 7(d1) Environmental Protection (Scenic) Zone and a new 7(d2) Environmental Protection (Woodland) Zone.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

The intention is that land zoned 7(d1) would be in public (Council) ownership. This land contains the trunk drainage for the site, except for an area of steep hillside land, generally above RL112, in the north western corner of the land to the west of the Wolin/Landco Joint Venture holding. The land would be effectively free of development. It is proposed that this land would go into Council ownership. This is generally accepted, though a detailed arrangement is yet to be negotiated.

Land zoned 7(d2) occurs in three parcels, reflecting Grey Box Woodland and Swamp Oak Forest in the northeast, northwest and southeast corners of the site. The development control table specifically permits greater bushland restoration than the 7(d1) zone. It nevertheless effectively sterilises the land from development. The detail of ownership and funding of land to be zoned Environmental Protection (Woodland) (7d2) remains undetermined and is a matter to be resolved prior to rezoning. Some form of ownership of the land with restrictions on title may be an option if appropriate arrangements for Council ownership cannot be negotiated.

Cumberland Plain Woodland

Other remnant Cumberland Plain Woodland in the southeastern sector of the Wolin/Landco holding is proposed to be zoned for urban edge lots. As the Threatened Species Conservation Act requires minimal intrusion of development, detailed consideration of the lot layout - perhaps by separation and clustering of dwellings to the north and south of the identified Cumberland Plain Woodland area - will be required as part of the development application process. Such an arrangement would be enforceable through a community titling regime.

Residual Land

A small area of land which adjoins existing residential development in Steamer Place is proposed to remain in its present zoning (LEP 48 – 7(d) Environmental Protection). This land adjoins the Christian Life Centre and is intended to be sold off to it.

Councillor Site Visit & Workshop

On Monday November 19, 2001 Councillors made a visit to the site and viewed it from distant points in the Mount Annan area. Afterwards a workshop was held where presentations were made by Council's consultant and by the proponent.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

Recent Subdivision

Following a recent subdivision, the legal description of the land at Manooka Valley has changed. Council's resolution should refer to Lot 466, DP 1017742 instead of Lot 576 DP1007061.

Conclusion

The subject land has been identified in the Camden Structure Plan as having urban development potential. Council has been informed that the land was placed on the Urban Development Program by the Minister for Urban Affairs and Planning by letter of 8 May 2001.

The Local Environmental Study and supporting technical studies have been commissioned by the Wolin/Landco Joint Venture but relate to the whole of the land which was the subject of Council's resolution of 23 October 2000 to prepare a draft LES and LEP. Supplementary information has been submitted on behalf of the Driver Group.

Relevant authorities were consulted in accordance with S.62 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

The draft LEP recognises and, where appropriate, preserves the area's unique attributes. It has the potential to reflect and implement the latest thinking on sustainable water management in an urban context. It preserves a significant area of Cumberland Plain Woodland and provides for implementation of a model for the physical and visual interface between Camden's rural and urban areas. It provides for efficient public transport in the context of Currans Hill.

In the case of the Driver Group the parties although well advanced have not satisfactorily finalised their plans to enable exhibition of a Master Plan. However it is considered unreasonable to delay exhibition of the draft LEP over the Wolin/Landco land any longer.

To deal with this situation, two mechanisms are available to overcome the absence of master plans for the overall site. Firstly a DCP could be made or extended (i.e. DCP 86) to cover the Driver Group land. This would require the adoption of a S94 contributions plan or developer agreement to make provision for public facilities.

Secondly Council could - after public exhibition - defer zoning of the Driver Group land until a co-ordinated proposal was received from owners, which would enable a separate Master Plan development application to be considered. This would also allow negotiation of a developer agreement for provision of

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 13 MAY, 2002, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

public facilities. The LEP could be amended to require approval of a Master Plan prior to any development consent being granted. A decision in respect of the final course of action will be made at the conclusion of the exhibition period.

DCP 58 would remain relevant to all of the Manooka Valley Estate, to the extent that it was not inconsistent with the proposed LEP amendment.

A Section 65 certificate for public exhibition may be signed by Council's delegate because the land is the subject of an agreed strategy (the UDP) with DUAP.

Recommended: That

- (i) The Local Environmental Study and Draft Local Environmental Plan be endorsed by Council for exhibition purposes.
- (ii) Council resolve to exhibit a Local Environmental Study and Draft Local Environmental Plan to generally rezone for urban and environmental protection purposes land known as Lot 466, DP1017742 (previously Lot 576, DP 1007061); Lots 34, 36, 37 and 38, DP 28024; Lots 352 and 351, DP 809159, Currans Hill and to seek relevant comment.
- (iii) The exhibition of the draft Local Environmental Study and Local Environmental Plan shall be for a period of no less than 8 weeks and shall be concurrent with exhibition of a Master Plan indicating a potential development scenario for Lot 466, DP1017742 (previously Lot 576, DP 1007061);
- (iv) Council advise all affected owners of the above resolution and of the process involved with the public exhibition.

MOTION

Moved Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr Batros that this Item be deferred and brought back to Council at the Development Committee Meeting on Tuesday the 11th June, 2002.

DC053/02 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED**.

The Meeting closed at 6.29pm.