

## **PLANNING FOCUS MEETING PRECINCT 2A AT OLD BAR 13 July, 2005**

|                    |        |                   |
|--------------------|--------|-------------------|
| Grant Calvin       | (GC)   | Convenor          |
| Bob Lauder         | (BL)   | Developer         |
| Wayne Hull         | (WH)   | GTCC              |
| Robert Baker       | (RB)   | GTCC              |
| Richard Pamplin    | (RP)   | GTCC              |
| Omar Farugi        | (OF)   | GTCC              |
| Bruce Moore        | (BM)   | GTCC              |
| Anthony Bryson     | (AB)   | DIPNR (Newcastle) |
| Sri Soerore        | (SS)   | DIPNR (Sydney)    |
| Greg Banks         | (GB)   | RFS               |
| Geoff Winning (GW) | Hunter | Wetlands          |
| Ray Stack          | (RS)   | Owner             |

### **On bus - at stop over the culvert on Banula Dve.**

WH expressed concern at the type and extent of works that the creek and environs provided for his department.

### **At silt trap at the end of Corkwood Street**

GC explained working of the silt trap.

BM asked question regarding the establishment of the reserve.

RP answered and provided detail of the deed of agreement.

GW asked a question regarding the agreement.

### **On walk to first causeway**

AB explained how the 40 metres came about – 20 metres related to Rivers and Foreshores Improvement Act open space, 20 metres for infrastructure.

GW recent studies suggest horse and cattle grazing has capacity to reduce vegetation biomass.

WH suggested that the extent of fencing on long narrow strips would make it uneconomic AB not in favour. The veg management plan would have difficulty incorporating this as difficult to control

RB suggested that if stock were excluded now there would be some natural regeneration

GC spoke about activities generally in 6A zone

BM advised all such activities need to demonstrate public benefit

### **At first causeway**

VARIOUS general discussion of drainage structures at this point, noted that the causeway is limit of SEPP14 and facilities above this point not in SEPP14 land

GC explained of drainage proposals on land west of the creek coming back to this point via series of swales

GW explained salt marsh management program – need to channelise fresh water flows

### **Between first and second causeways**

VARIOUS general discussion of SEPP 14 boundary amendments

GC excess material from roadworks

OF talked about methods of getting drainage back to the ponds at causeway  
VARIOUS consensus that it can be achieved, need for creative ideas.  
RB and OF departed to attend another meeting

#### **At second culvert**

GC posed question of need for culvert, removal to cause damage to upstream community  
GB not required as a fire trail  
SS and GW discussed likely impact of removal and need for maintenance if retained. Nothing definite.  
GB responding to a question advised that the veget structure at the causeway is Group2

#### **Between second culvert and western boundary**

WH discussed with council planners how he is resourced. Gets 10% of rate income. Would need far more blocks than will be achieved here to fund maintenance of 9 hectares.

#### **At western boundary of the unzoned area**

AB no additional planting required where natural vegetation is quite wide. Perhaps a little widening where natural veg narrows higher up to the south

#### **The meeting Continued at the meeting room in the Bowling Club**

GC - perimeter road required – general agreement.

- salt marshes
- activities in the 6A zone. Construction of road fully in 6A zone.

GW stated reveg more costly than grass particularly in development stage

BM countered that this might be actual cost, but not to Council if developer required to accept responsibility during the development stage.

BM in conflict with GC on whether there should be anything in this area.

GB while ownership of the area in the 6A zone remains with the developer, he is happy that the APZ should be incorporated in this area, however, once it passes to Council ownership it should then be accommodated in the developer's remaining land.

WH asked for his view

RP talks about a compromise, road half in and half out of the 6A zone

BL says there is previous agreement for road and services in the 6A zone

SS suggests that there is no place for a road in a 6A zone

RS advises that he attended Council meeting where he understood that such agreement had been reached

RP advises no formal agreement? Seems to still want to compromise.

SS apologises for having to leave to catch her plane. Requests that the Master Plan provide for a range of different residential development types and a range of block sizes for those differing types and also for a range of prices

RS wants to move on from the discussion of what can occur in the 6A zone

GC talks about the road pattern

AB talks about the types of rehab and variety trees shrubs grasses

GW talks about the outlook – not necessarily tall vegetation blocking visually aspect from the perimeter road.

AB talks about 20 metres being the normal requirement under the Rivers and Foreshores Improvement Act.