

## MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	BALLINA COUNCIL MEETING	MEETING NUMBER	# 1
HELD AT	TAMAR AND CHERRY ST BALLINA	DATE	16 FEB 06
PROJECT	COASTAL GROVE LENNOX HEAD	TIME	11:30AM – 1:00PM
ATTENDEES	Sarah Kelly SK SAKE Development Steve Barnier SB Ballina Shire Council Kate Singleton KS "		
APOLOGIES			

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
No. 1	Introduction and Project Overview	SK

SK outlined her role and that SAKE Development would manage and facilitate the development of the Survey Street site on behalf of the landowners, David and Ruth Dossor. SK is in the formative stages of the project and was aiming to take a consultative role with Ballina Council even though the Minister for Planning is the consent authority for the project.

The initial project team had been formed with the key members including HASSELL as master planners and landscape architects and Patterson Britton as stormwater engineers. A complete project team would be appointed once the DG's requirements were issued and all matters would be addressed.

SK noted that the Department of Planning had advised that the development is a Major Project and Part 3A of the Act will therefore apply. SK noted the team will be seeking project approval and not concept approval. SK and the team were preparing the preliminary environmental assessment which will be referred to Ballina Council by the Department of Planning in terms of issuing the DG requirements.

SB indicated he had been involved in the site and development for a number of years, including the LES that was prepared as a precursor to the rezoning (the LES was prepared by Jim Glazebrook and team) and was comprehensive. The rezoning occurred in 1999. Survey Street has also been identified in the Council's Urban Land Release Strategy, Strategic Plan and Structure Plan for residential development.

The recent history related to the LEC case regarding the 54 lot subdivision and master plans submitted for the site. The DA for subdivision, whilst the Council officers recommended the application for approval the Council overturned this and the Court dismissed the appeal. Key issues from the Court case that will be pertinent to this application are stormwater, geotechnical matters and possibly building envelopes related to future housing. Other matters were concluded by the Court to be acceptable and would not preclude the development (such as traffic generation and the capacity of the road networks, flora and fauna etc) subject to various conditions.

In terms of stormwater, the issues include the Court's requirement for off line treatment and the appropriateness of wetlands (which should form part of the development). SK noted that the team would aim for no net increase in pollutant loads and runoff, with on site treatment. Wetlands and a WSUD approach would be adopted. Fencing of the wetlands as necessary would be included to ensure safety, particularly for young children.

## MEETING MINUTES

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
----------	-------------	--------

In terms of geotechnical matters and site stability, this will need to be reviewed as like much of Lennox Head and the ridgeline area, the ridgeline is spring loaded which will affect building envelopes. The stability of this area to accommodate housing will need to be confirmed. It was noted that Coffey had reviewed this following the Court case.

SB raised the visual impact issue in previous DA and court case, notably the concerns of neighbouring residents particularly in Survey Street. The court addressed the issue of visual impact and concluded that the proposed 54 lot subdivision represented an overdevelopment and the visual impacts would be significant but not determinative. Building envelopes would be desirable, particularly with respect to visual and view corridors. SK did note that property owners do not enjoy view rights, which is also a precedent established by the LEC, but this matter would be addressed in the submission.

### No. 2 The Approach

SK noted that the team would take a reasonably consultative approach in talking with the Council and relevant agencies, plus interested stakeholders. The consultation will be determined by the Minister for Planning. SB noted that the adjoining residents were well informed and generally used consultants to review the applications submitted to the Minister or Council. The neighbours, particularly in Survey Street, take a keen interest in the proposed development. The property owner on the eastern side (known as Newton) has a large land holding and has also been exploring options to develop her land (integrated resort/eco tourist type development).

Stormwater is a key issue for not only the council and agencies, but residents. Newton has a number of concerns about stormwater, as much drains onto her land and forms a lagoon (not only from the Dossors but the Survey Street area). There are a range of issues raised by the residents which are addressed in the LEC proceedings.

### No. 3 Major Project

SK noted that the team would be seeking Project Approval and not Concept Plan approval. Concept approvals, as determined by the Department's guidelines related to freeway developments, major new schools or hospitals where an indicative layout or master plan would be beneficial. A preliminary environmental assessment would be submitted to the Department of Planning to determine the DG's requirements for the development. These would be referred to Ballina Council.

Council noted that the key issues evolved from the court case and included:

- Stormwater management
- Geotech matters and building envelopes as the ridgeline is spring loaded.
- Coastal access issues (notably any opportunity for improved access to the coast).

SB was happy to facilitate any meetings with the council's engineers and the like as required.

SK noted that in terms of the master plan required under SEPP 71, the Department of Planning had advised that this requirement would need to be waived with the Project Application submission. The development would all fall under Part 3A and would become a project approval.

## MEETING MINUTES

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
----------	-------------	--------

### No. 4 Relevant Council Documents

SK asked which were the relevant plans for the site. KS noted that a DCP was currently being prepared for residential development in Lennox Head by Humphreys Reynolds Perkins (in Brisbane) which is exploring character analysis and statements. It is looking at contemporary design controls. A background report and position paper will be released in the next few months.

KS also provided the latest Council strategies including:

- Lennox Head Structure Plan
- Urban Land Release Strategy and the recent addendum.

### No 5. Other Matters

- Concept approval vs Project Approval. Guidelines note that Concept approval relates to new freeways, hospitals and educational institutions.
- SEPP 71 and master plans (Staged DA's or DCP's now, but will not apply as this is Part 3A). DoP advised in a previous meeting (August 05) that with the application, we will need to apply to waive the need for a master plan, as the site is a Major Project under Part 3A.
- Planning agreements, Section 94 works and relevant credits. SB noted that a report had recently been forwarded to Council regarding planning agreements. SK indicated that the Dossors would provide what was fair and reasonable (and legal) and would discuss this with the Department of Planning. SK also asked whether works on site for public open space would receive a credit. SB noted this was could be sought for passive open space, but S94 contributions would apply to the active open space component for regional works and facilities (ie credit applies to local works only).
- SB noted that Council was also developing a coastal bike plan (conceptual only), particularly near the Coast Road to link Ballina with the coastal villages. There may be some opportunity or link with the Dossor land.

SK talked about the potential for a dwelling house at Blue Seas Pde in the area zoned 1(d) Urban Investigation and noted the provision in the LEP for development of land on adjoining boundaries (50 metre). KS/SB indicated that SEPP 71 prohibits this provision. SK also noted that Part 3A enabled development that is otherwise prohibited provided that the development is permitted on part of the site. Part 3A provided opportunities to enable otherwise prohibited development.

SK noted that the team would be in contact in the future. KS will be the key point of contact.

## MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	BALLINA COUNCIL MEETING	MEETING NUMBER	# 2
HELD AT	TAMAR AND CHERRY ST BALLINA	DATE	1 JUNE 06
PROJECT	COASTAL GROVE LENNOX HEAD	TIME	2:00PM – 4:30PM
ATTENDEES			
	Sarah Kelly	SK	SAKE Development
	Richard Baker	RB	Patterson Britton (Stormwater and Civil Engineering)
	Paul Busmanis	PB	Ballina Shire – Engineering Works Manager
	Don Chesworth	DC	Ballina Shire Council – Water and Sewer
	Rod Haig	RH	Ballina Shire – Water and Sewer
	Jacqui Hansen	JH	Ballina Shire - Civil Services Group Asset Manager
	Andrew Smith	AS	Ballina Shire - Development Services Manager
	Steve Barnier	SB	Ballina Shire – Executive Strategic Planner
	Kate Singleton	KS	Ballina Shire – Strategic Planner
APOLOGIES			

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
<b>No. 1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>SK/SB</b>

A brief introduction and recap occurred by both SK and SB. It was noted that the team was preparing a Project Application and the Minister for Planning is the consent authority. SAKE Development, who was managing the project on behalf of the landowners, had received the Director General's requirements for the preparation of the application. The DGR's mandate consultation with a number of government agencies and Ballina Council. It was noted that today was part of the formative consultation and an information gathering exercise. A draft plan had been prepared and the team is looking at 45 allotments with associated roads, open space and civil works.

SB also discussed some of the project history. The rezoning in 1999 for residential purposes, the 54 lot subdivision DA and court case (that was dismissed by the court); and the more recent master plan. The key issues that emerged from the court proceeding included stormwater management (quantity and quality not to exceed pre-existing flows and condition), geotechnical matters and site stability. These were the key matters with others seen as not determinative such as traffic and access, flora and fauna etc. SB also noted that potential impacts on amenity from the perspective of surrounding residents was also an issue.

<b>No. 2</b>	<b>Water and Sewer</b>	<b>RB/RH</b>
	<i>Water</i>	

Dual reticulation vs rainwater tanks. Ballina Council will insist that dual reticulation is provided as part of all new subdivisions to accommodate recycled water that will service Ballina and Lennox Head, in accordance with the Urban Water Management Strategy. Council is not able to provide a date that recycled water would be available for the site. Rod Haig is currently working on consolidating Councils works program to determine the indicative timeline for the implementation of recycled water for the area. *(Note: The indicative timeline is also dependent on studies being undertaken by GHD as part of WRAAP).*

## MEETING MINUTES

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
-------------	-------------	--------

### No. 2 Water and Sewer contd

SK raised concern at having to provide the infrastructure, with no guarantee as to when (or possibly if) the recycled water will be available. There will be a doubling of the infrastructure provided which seems onerous and a waste of infrastructure. This will occur at some cost to the landowners.

An additional meeting was held with DC and RH regarding the servicing of the site with water and sewer. It was noted that an investigation has been completed by Council that proposed the decommissioning of three sewer pump stations and upgrading of one of the existing stations. Council indicated that the construction of the proposed pump station upgrade could be used to offset the infrastructure contribution for sewer. It was indicated that servicing the site with sewer should be readily achievable.

DC noted that while the provision of water supply should be fairly straightforward, water pressure may be an issue.

It was indicated that the site should be able to be serviced by utilising existing infrastructure. However, council indicated that they would undertake further investigation once they are provided with final details of the proposed subdivision.

BASIX dictates a 40% reduction in water use for dwelling houses. The provision of rainwater tanks would satisfy this requirement and could be readily accommodated on the site due to the slope. Council noted that for other developments (Pacific Pines Estate) that through negotiations with the DoP, dual reticulation was required. Council would also permit BASIX approval for the water reduction based on the provision of dual reticulation infrastructure. SK noted it was likely that the DoP would need to agree to this.

SB noted that if dual reticulation is not proposed the proponent will need to demonstrate that it is not feasible. SB also noted that the proponent may wish to incorporate both dual reticulation and rainwater tanks (as a stormwater management measure).

### No. 3 Stormwater

RB indicated that the stormwater quality and quantity targets for the site would be to ensure that pre development stormwater quality and quantity levels are not exceeded. The current stormwater treatment scheme was briefly introduced including swales, wetlands and GPT's. SK advised that in relation to the 6(a) zoned land the proponent is looking to dedicate the open space to Council, and possibly the rainforest to NPWS. JH noted that given the infrastructure proposed in the reserve, Council would need to be convinced that it is in the interest of the community to commit to the ongoing management of the land.

## MEETING MINUTES

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
<b>No. 3</b>	<b>Stormwater Contd</b>	
	PB indicated that the ongoing maintenance of the proposed stormwater treatment measures along with safety would be a concern to Council. PB noted that the main issue for Council regarding GPTs and wetlands is the provision of access for trucks and sufficient room to undertake maintenance. PB also noted that long term maintenance and ongoing management need to be addressed. Rehabilitation when the design-life has been reached should also be addressed if it is proposed to dedicate the land to Council.	
	It was suggested that Graham Plumb of Council be contacted to determine the requirement for a detailed mosquito investigation.	RB
	PB indicated that "flooding" on the site should not be a problem. However, local stormwater capacity and overflow paths need to be addressed. Also, the new development may block current flow paths, and this also needs to be addressed. RB indicated that appropriate modelling would be completed to set minimum floor levels (100 year ARI levels).	RB
	RB noted that there is an existing large scour hole under an existing stormwater outlet located on the western boundary of the site. It was indicated that this large scour hole would be remediated as part of the proposed works.	
<b>No. 4</b>	<b>Road Design</b>	
	SK asked about road design and widths (noting some local streets in Lennox Head were extraordinarily wide). JH is the appropriate person to discuss road widths and design (to occur at a later stage). One issue is to ensure that waste / garbage vehicles could manoeuvre through the site. SB asked if buses would service the development. It was noted that a bus stop is located on the Survey Street bend (near the reserve). Further discussion with JH to occur with the engineers (Patterson Britton).	JH/RB
	An additional discussion was held with JH who provided a copy of Councils Interim Roads Subdivision Code. JH indicated that if we proposed to adopt different road widths than those outlined in the code that we should consult with Council before proceeding.	
<b>No 5.</b>	<b>Flora and Fauna</b>	
	SB noted that the concept differed from previous ones in terms of the proposed use of the Crown Road Reserve for access. SB advised that Council's Environmental Scientist, Ian Gaskell, had recently determined a threatened species of grass was located in the vicinity and that this issue should be discussed with him and addressed in the Flora and Fauna Assessment. SK advised that the proponent's Flora and Fauna Consultant, Peter Parker had undertaken a site inspection and was unable to locate the threatened grass species on the subject site. KS noted that Ian Gaskell should also be consulted regarding addressing the potential downstream impacts of the proposed development, as the threatened grass species has been identified on the adjoining property. In this regard the potential impacts of any changes to existing hydrology will be required to be considered.	SK/PP

## MEETING MINUTES

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
<b>No. 6</b>	<b>Open Space Areas</b>	
	A brief discussion was held regarding the open space – future management and dedication issues. Jillian Pratten – Manager of Open Spaces and Reserves will need to be consulted about this matter, but it was noted that Council's initial response is that it is not keen to take on this responsibility given the stormwater infrastructure proposed to be sited within this area (see comments above).	<b>SK</b>
	The issue of wetland design and safety was raised. The death of a child in Casino was noted as a case for concern. Safety and prevention of potential drowning will be paramount for the Council. RB asked whether a dry solution would be preferred by Council. PB indicated that this is Council's preference.	<b>RB</b>
<b>No. 5</b>	<b>Town Planning and Building Design</b>	
	SK noted in terms of the overall lot layout, all complied with the zoning. A lot will be proposed to the north of Blue Seas Parade that is zoned Urban Investigation. Under Part 3A, it is understood that the Minister has the ability to approve applications that are not consistent with the zoning, provided that the appropriate environmental analysis is undertaken. In terms of this allotment, it is flat, does not contain significant vegetation and enjoys good views. SK had met with the neighbours who in principle did not raise any objection to the proposed allotment (or development).	<b>SK</b>
	SB asked whether it is proposed to undertake any rehabilitation of the 7(d) escarpment area. SK advised that it is not proposed. KS noted that the proponent should discuss funding opportunities for work within this area with Ian Gaskell.	
	AS talked about building envelopes and future housing development (including dual occupancies) as the land is contained within the area for Planned Urban Development which does not include controls for residential development (such as FSR, setbacks and the like). It was felt that this site could develop its own controls, particularly as there may be scope to reduce / increase setbacks with respect to location of allotments, views or the like. KS noted that with the current review of the DCP for Lennox Head, there maybe scope to add certain sites, such as Survey Street, as an annexure to the DCP with building footprints or other controls (such as light weight construction, colours/materials to reflect the coastal/urban location). Alternatively, Section 88b instruments or covenants could be explored, but these were also viewed as problematic (under Section 28 of the EP&A Act, the restrictions will be nullified to the extent they are inconsistent with the development). Clause 29 of the Ballina LEP authorises this provision.	
	SB advised that covenants were acceptable where it can be demonstrated that they are for a legitimate public purpose, which may be the case in the circumstances in relation to building envelopes, building height etc. AS noted that in order to provide some level of certainty for adjoining and future residents, details of the proposed controls for allotments and how the 'intentions' will be followed through should be provided with the application.	

## MEETING MINUTES

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
----------	-------------	--------

### No 6 Community Consultation

SK walked through the proposed consultation strategy with Council, the community and government agencies.

#### *Ballina Council*

In terms of the Council officers, it was agreed to conduct a workshop (tentative date is Thursday 6 July, 2:00pm – 4:00pm) in the Council chambers with key members of the Coastal Grove team. The team would conduct a PowerPoint presentation once the subdivision and landscape plans were more finalised, and the stormwater management and civil design was further advanced. The presentation would also look at site analysis.

In terms of the councillors, a briefing or presentation may occur once the Project Application is lodged. SK can discuss with the General Manager if any consultation should occur and in what form.

#### *Community Groups*

SK sought advice on existing community groups such as a precinct committee to enable preliminary consultation. SB advised that there is the Lennox Head Monitoring Committee, a committee run through the Council. Its key role is to monitor implementation of the Strategic Actions in the Strategic Plan. The committee is chaired and facilitated by the Council. SK to write to the Council about a potential presentation to the committee in the future. The Chamber of Commerce is represented on the Committee.

#### *Residents and Stakeholder Consultation.*

SK noted that a two pronged approach would occur with the residents and other stakeholders. Prior to the lodgement of the application and in the preparation of the Project Application, SAKE Development will write to key adjoining neighbours advising of the application and proposed future development seeking input and the key issues from the residents perspective. Once the application is lodged, 2-3 information sessions will be held at a venue to be determined. The drop in facility would include copies of the application and some display material where people could review the application (site analysis plans, landscape master plan etc). Members of the project team would be available at one information session to answer any detailed questions. This would occur from say Tuesday to Thursday afternoon (4:30pm to 6:30pm). SB suggested the CWA in Lennox Head. This would be a very suitable location. Council will provide contact details for the CWA.

### Next Meeting

Tbd

Possibly Thursday 6 July, Ballina Council Chambers.



# Ballina Council Workshop

Monday 3 July 2006

1:30pm – 4:00pm

Ballina Shire Council  
Tamar & Cherry Streets

**Meeting:** Coastal Grove Presentation and Workshop

1 Survey Street Lennox Head

**Note taker:** Sarah Kelly

<b>Attendees:</b>	Sarah Kelly	SAKE
	Richard Baker and Mark Tooker	Patterson Britton
	Debbie Eastment and Lisa White	HASSELL
	Nicola Gibson	MG Planning
	Peter Parker	Peter Parker Environmental
	Alix Carpenter	Department of Planning
	Paul Busmanis and Rod Haig	Ballina Shire
	Andrew Smith and Steve Barnier	Ballina Shire
	Kate Singleton and Ian Gaskall	Ballina Shire

**Apologies :** Don Chesworth, Ballina Shire Water and Sewer  
Jacqui Hansen, Ballina Shire Civil Services Group  
Jillian Pratten, Ballina Shire, Open Space and Reserves Manager

## Agenda topics (See Meeting Agenda)

### Stormwater Management / Rain Gardens / Swales

#### Discussion:

Best practice approach – WSUD. No wetlands but a dry treatment with rain gardens, swales and GPTs

The rain gardens – bio retention basins. Low wide area that promotes water ponding, which infiltrates into lower stratum with drainage pipes provided under. Removes problem with mosquitos, as this is a dry solution.

Roof water is not collected for re-use.

Easement to be provided through hillside lots to accommodate drainage from the Crown Road Reserve.

Reduce stormwater flows (overland) and control peak flows to existing rates, to closer mimic the rural context. During peak flows rain gardens will act as detention basins.

Swales along the road edge capture initial runoff, which is then re-directed into the raingardens for further treatment. One-way cross fall on the bottom road - council had no objections.

Improve stormwater quality (10% reduction in pollutants).

Management of WSUD. Flushing of drain system and occasional trimming of vegetation. GPTS – cleaning using councils existing street sweeper and vacuum hose - preferably use Council's standard GPT specification.

Maintain water quality run off as to not impact threatened grass south of the site (Ecology)

## **Stormwater Management / Rain Gardens / Swales (contd)**

Conclusions: Proposed allotments along the steeper slopes (near the Crown Road) will need to align to enable inter-allotment drainage. Easements will be necessary.

Action items: RB to send SB images of rain gardens and landscape swales in SEQ area.

RB / MT to follow up with PB regarding Council GPTs – proposed development to incorporate standard Council GPTs.

Modify subdivision plan to ensure allotments are aligned to enable inter-allotment drainage and drainage from the Crown Road Reserve.

## **Water / Dual Reticulation and Sewer**

Discussion: Reduce potable water use (up to 60% with dual reticulation). Provide dual reticulation infrastructure. Understand that this meets the BASIX requirement to reduce potable water (40% requirement), even though recycled water not available for at least 5/6 years. Council aim is for 80% effluent reuse by 2013 and 20% by 2008. GHD currently completing the analysis.

Sewer contribution is \$7,000 / lot. Option of funding upgrade of SP3107 in lieu of contributions - assuming the calculations are reasonably equivalent. Otherwise, developer can pay the contribution, but will need to wait until Council completes the sewer upgrade.

Conclusions: Determine the dual reticulation infrastructure meets the BASIX requirement for potable water reduction.

Action items:

Ballina Council and PB to liaise with the DoP about BASIX reductions and dual reticulation. Note that Pacific Pines has adopted this approach (and not included rainwater tanks but relied on future recycled water supply).

RB to cost the sewer upgrade in comparison with the proposed contribution (\$315K based on 45 lots) and determine whether the cost/contribution is comparable.

## **Park Design and Facilities / Dedication and Management**

Discussion: Low maintenance park design with rainforest and riparian plantings. Children's play equipment proposed on site, located on flatter land (which is zoned residential).

Wetlands removed from design – to improve safety and reduce hazards (particularly for children). Reduced on-going costs associated with streamlined design.

Further discussion is required with Jillian Pratten and others regarding the proposed dedication of open space areas and on going maintenance responsibilities (and costs).

Preliminary discussion with JP about potential use of a Planning Agreement regarding proposed dedication, works, maintenance periods and any credits (for local open space facilities). However, this may not be an appropriate solution as PA's are unknown to the Council. The modified design (without wetlands etc) may enable a more standard approach.

Conclusions: Meet with Jillian Pratten on 24 July 2006 with possibly Paul Bsumanis and Jacqui Hansen.

Action items:

DE and RB to prepare some notes on maintenance measures required for the proposed park and stormwater system. Look at likely on-going costs involved with the proposed design.

Project team to prepare outline of a planning agreement for Council's consideration

## **Built Form / Views / DCP and General Planning Issues**

Discussion: HASSELL preparing visual impact assessment in context of site analysis and opportunities/constraints mapping.

Preparing simple design guidelines for future housing (plans and sections) particularly for the more sensitive areas of the site (area below the ridgeline on the lower slope of the Crown Reserve and lots that back onto existing residential properties on Survey Street).

The design guidelines will address local context (housing types, streets, verges etc), building heights, setbacks, materials / colours, landscaping and fencing.

Understood that Council is preparing a new DCP for the Lennox Head area. Survey Street will form an Appendix to the DCP and will be an individual precinct (along with other sites in Lennox Head that will be identified as Precincts).

KS noted that Council is working on a Lennox Head character statement, to be completed end of July. KS to forward a copy for information and to assist with the visual assessment.

Conclusions: AS and SB asked that we also address cut / fill and dual occupancy controls for the Survey Street precinct annexure to the DCP.

Action items: KS to provide any guidelines, proforma or matters to be addressed in the DCP appendix for Survey Street, if these are made available by Council's planning consultant (HPR).

Additional matters as noted above to be addressed in the guidelines / DCP appendix.

## **Subdivision Plan**

Discussion: Noted that the proposal involves 45 residential lots, generally 670 – 1500sqm. One lot is proposed near the escarpment which is approx 520sqm on land zoned Urban Investigation.

Larger lots found on steeper slopes with conventional lots located on flatter land.

Roads linked / connected, particularly the Crown reservation and internal roads.

Setbacks and buffers provided, including 20m setback from creek / drainage corridor.

Conclusions: Council noted that there new shire wide LEP is required by 2009 – therefore no imminent changes to planning regime.

Action items: No further action required. Note that lots near the Crown Road reserve will be aligned to enable inter-allotment drainage.

## **Flora and Fauna**

Discussion: Land generally cleared and used for low scale cattle grazing. SEPP 26 rainforest located on the escarpment and the adjoining Amber Drive Reserve. The reserve contains the endangered *Fontainea*. 15 metre + setback proposed to the Amber Drive Reserve and endangered *Fontainea*.

IG noted the existence of rare grass species downstream of the site.

Council has nominated the escarpment and SEPP 26 land for possible funding by DEC to carry out rehabilitation work.

Conclusions: IG noted that the corner block near the Amber Drive Reserve, sufficient setback is required from vegetation (particularly to any planting located on the Dossor land).

IG noted that the plantings near the ridge/Crown Road reserve will need to be removed (in part) to enable access to these lots. It is not known why the Dossors carried out this planting near the ridge line.

Action items: Design team to consider a special side setback to Lot No1 to accommodate supplementary rainforest vegetation along the western boundary.

## Consultation

Discussion: It was noted that this was the third meeting with council.

Consultations with government agencies had been undertaken and were now complete.

An information / drop in was being held with the local community on 24 July from 4:30pm – 7:30pm. This is being held at the CWA Hall and council / community will be notified via a letter box drop and invitations.

SK had written to the Lennox Head Monitoring Committee and offered to present the proposed scheme. The next meeting is on Monday 7 August.

Conclusions: Consultation was noted. Understood that the Monitoring Committee welcomes the proposed presentation.

Action items: Karina Vikstrom is the contact regarding the Monitoring Committee. SK to liaise regarding any proposed presentation.

## General

SK noted that the team intended to lodge the Project Application in September.

It is understood that the DoP assess the application to determine that it addresses the DGR's and will issue the application to the agencies to ensure that the application has addressed the relevant matters (note that this step is simply to ensure that the application addresses the requirements and is not intended as an assessment period). If the application is acceptable, the application is exhibited for 30 days and then reported to the Minister for Planning for determination.

AC noted that Council seemed pleased with the progress and application. The key issue related to dedication of open space areas and on-going maintenance and management. SK noted that the team is aiming to resolve this matter, in collaboration with council.

## MEETING NOTES

MEETING	BALLINA COUNCIL MEETING			MEETING NUMBER	# 4																		
HELD AT	TAMAR AND CHERRY ST BALLINA			DATE	25 JULY 2006																		
PROJECT	COASTAL GROVE LENNOX HEAD			TIME	9:00AM – 10:30AM																		
ATTENDEES	<table><tr><td>Sarah Kelly</td><td>SK</td><td>SAKE Development (Development Management)</td></tr><tr><td>Richard Baker</td><td>RB</td><td>Patterson Britton (Stormwater and Civil Engineering)</td></tr><tr><td>Debbie Eastment</td><td>DE</td><td>HASSELL (Landscaping and Urban Design)</td></tr><tr><td>Jillian Pratten</td><td>JP</td><td>Ballina Shire – Manager Open Space and Reserves</td></tr><tr><td>Jacqui Hansen</td><td>JH</td><td>Ballina Shire - Civil Services Group Asset Manager</td></tr><tr><td>Kate Singleton</td><td>KS</td><td>Ballina Shire – Strategic Planner</td></tr></table>					Sarah Kelly	SK	SAKE Development (Development Management)	Richard Baker	RB	Patterson Britton (Stormwater and Civil Engineering)	Debbie Eastment	DE	HASSELL (Landscaping and Urban Design)	Jillian Pratten	JP	Ballina Shire – Manager Open Space and Reserves	Jacqui Hansen	JH	Ballina Shire - Civil Services Group Asset Manager	Kate Singleton	KS	Ballina Shire – Strategic Planner
Sarah Kelly	SK	SAKE Development (Development Management)																					
Richard Baker	RB	Patterson Britton (Stormwater and Civil Engineering)																					
Debbie Eastment	DE	HASSELL (Landscaping and Urban Design)																					
Jillian Pratten	JP	Ballina Shire – Manager Open Space and Reserves																					
Jacqui Hansen	JH	Ballina Shire - Civil Services Group Asset Manager																					
Kate Singleton	KS	Ballina Shire – Strategic Planner																					
APOLOGIES	Nicola Gibson	NG	MG Planning																				

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
<b>No. 1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>SK</b>
	<p>The project team was introduced and some of the background to the development including a number of meetings held with Council in the past 6 months, the previous court case and the context of the site (south of the town centre, surrounding low density residential areas etc).</p>	
<b>No. 2</b>	<b>Open Space Design and Dedication</b>	
	<p>SK walked JP through the site and proposed development. It was noted that there is some 1.3ha of land zoned for open space purposes and the project team is looking to dedicate approximately 3.1ha – which excludes the northern escarpment area and the land zoned Environmental Protection to the south. However, it was noted a pedestrian / cycle connection is proposed to link with Seamist Place which is part of the open space corridor and dedication to Council, which is zoned Environmental Protection.</p> <p>The proposed design includes a riparian corridor with a 20 metre setback from the top from bank of the drainage line; rainforest plantings, a children's play area near the existing residential lots on Survey Street to enhance accessibility for not only residents on site, but in the locality; and pedestrian / cycle links through the park and connecting to Seamist Place.</p> <p>In terms of the stormwater strategy, a series of rain gardens are proposed with landscape swales and GPTs. RB described how the rain gardens and swales worked, as outlined in a memo prepared by Patterson Britton dated 18 July 2006 that was issued to Council prior to the meeting.</p>	
	JP asked that as part of our submission, a maintenance plan be prepared that outlines an appropriate regime to look after the stormwater system. Council needs to be informed about how to maintain some of these contemporary stormwater elements such as flushing of the under drains etc.	<b>RB</b>
	In terms of the playground design, Council would like a say in this including the provision of shade structures and the choice of play equipment (Kompan generally preferred). The project team will therefore include in our Statement of Commitments that the team will work with Council in the design of the playground area.	<b>DE/NG</b>

## MEETING NOTES

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	JP noted that the dedication of the open space area was generally supported. In terms of a maintenance period for the dedication of open space for this project, it would be approximately 2-3 years. The dedication requirements would be outlined in a condition of development approval and follow the standard approach by Council and would not be subject to a planning agreement.	NG/SK
	SK asked that if the project team was providing local open space needs, as part of the Section 94 contributions, would we not pay for the local open space facilities as these were being provided on site and to meet the needs of the residents? The developer however would contribute to regional / district open space facilities and community facilities. KS indicated that Council can provide a breakdown of the S94 Open Space provision for local and regional/district parks. The development will therefore seek a credit for the local open space provided on site.	KS
<b>No. 3 Proposed Road Design</b>		
	RB walked JH through the proposed road design. RB noted that some retaining walls would be required along the lower road and the near the Crown Road reserve. JH noted that in terms of the lower road, the drawings will need to show driveway crossings where the retaining walls are proposed and these should be included in the civil design.	RB
	In terms of the Crown Road and the retaining walls, it was discussed whether the road could be narrowed and no footpath provided with the aim of reducing the height of the retaining walls. JH noted as this is designed to function as a local road – a public road – then the width and design could not be compromised. There was some discussion about the process for the Crown Road dedication – it is understood that this will be transferred to Council from the Dept of Lands provided the design is acceptable to Council. David Kelly is the appropriate contact at Council.	RB
	Traffic calming may be provided and JH noted that a good location would be near the footpath crossing to the open space on the lower road. Garbage trucks will be able to access the site and the roads will be able to accommodate buses in the future as required.	RB
	It was noted that footpaths to streets would be provided with street trees. In terms of street trees, Council prefer rainforest species. JP/KS provided HASSELL with a list of preferred / indicative street tree species.	
<b>No. 4 Conclusion</b>		
	It was noted that this is likely to be the final meeting with Council before the application is submitted to the Department. The team is aiming to lodge the application by September this year. It is not known how long the Department will take to determine the application or place it on exhibition.	Note
	<b>Next Meeting</b>	Note
	No further meetings required	