

GENERAL PURPOSE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1 ENVIRONMENT

GENERAL PURPOSE COMMITTEE - ENVIRONMENT**Table of Contents****Meeting Date:** 26 July 1994**Page** 2

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
-	SECTION 1 - ENVIRONMENT.	
21:	POULTRY FARM EXTENSIONS - LOT 6 DP215575 NO. 53 WALLACE ROAD, VINEYARD - J XUEREB DA117/94/EVD	4
22:	TYRE LANDFILL - HENDRENS ROAD, EBENEZER DA347/92/GMA	8
23:	HOLLANDS PADDOCK CAR PARK - COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT P1408/95 PT2/GMA	11
24:	DEMOLITION OF WEATHERBOARD COTTAGE - 339 WINDSOR STREET, RICHMOND DA281/93 PT1/GMA	12
25:	URBAN LAND RELEASES GT190/002 PT2/GMA	15
26:	TREE REMOVAL - PROSPECT ELECTRICITY GE010/004PT02/EVD	18
27:	RE-INSTatement OF AFTER HOURS COURTESY KENNELS GE020/002/EVD	21
28:	WEATHERBOARD COTTAGE - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO DEMOLISH - 80 LENNOX STREET, RICHMOND - V & P TCHADOVITCH P515/135/EVD	22
29:	THE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT ACT, 1979 - AMENDMENTS GC070/006 PT2/EVD	23
30:	ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT REGULATION 1980 - CHANGES TO SCHEDULE 3 - DESIGNATED DEVELOPMENT GT090/001 PT2, LEP8/91 PT1/EVD	26
31:	SHOPPING CENTRE PROPOSAL - PAGET, WINDSOR AND EAST MARKET STREETS, RICHMOND P1343.212/10 PT1/EVD	33
32:	MUSHROOM COMPOSTERS PTY LTD - POST OFFICE ROAD, EBENEZER P1609.110 PT8/EVD	36

GENERAL PURPOSE COMMITTEE - ENVIRONMENT

Table of Contents

Meeting Date: 26 July 1994

Page 3

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
33:	INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN	
	DCP1/93/EVD	37

******* END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS *******

GENERAL PURPOSE COMMITTEE - ENVIRONMENT

Meeting Date: **26 July 1994**

Item: **21**

ITEM 21: POULTRY FARM EXTENSIONS - LOT 6 DP215575 NO. 53
WALLACE ROAD, VINEYARD - J XUEREB

FILE NUMBER: DA117/94/EVD

Owner: J Xuereb
Stat. Provisions: Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 1989
Area: 3.265ha
Zone: Rural 1(c)
Advertising: Adjoining owners notified with 5 submissions received
Date Received: 11 May 1994

Key Issues:

Odour
Noise
Amenity

Action:

Approval with conditions

REPORT:

Council is in receipt of an application proposing the extension of an existing poultry farm. The site currently accommodates a poultry farm comprising of 3 sheds. This application proposes to extend 2 of the sheds by 60 metres to match the third shed. The buildings will have a height of 4.4 metres being finished in a corrugated iron roof with open sides.

The site currently has the capacity to accommodate 48,000 birds, however, this application will enable the keeping of an additional 18,000 birds.

Statutory Situation

The proposal would be defined as an "animal establishment" which is a use permissible with consent under Hawkesbury Local Environmental 1989.

Submission

Five submissions were received in relation to the application, objecting on the following grounds:-

- odour
- noise
- disposal of chicken carcasses
- dust

Planning Comments

The subject property is generally regular in shape with an area of 3.265 ha. The site has a frontage of approximately 70 metres and a length in excess of 350 metres. The 3 existing sheds are setback approximately 130 metres from Wallace Road and run parallel towards the rear of the block. This application proposes to extend the 2 smaller sheds by approximately 60 metres towards the rear of the site.

Council has adopted a Code for the Development of Poultry Farms. This code provides setback requirements from various boundaries and between sheds. This application will comply with these requirements. The total site area of 3.265ha is below the 4ha required under the code, however, as this is an existing farm, the proposal is satisfactory in these terms.

Noise

The majority of noise complaints arise from the workers collecting the chickens rather than the birds themselves. The nature of the industry is such that chickens need to be collected at night when they are at their quietest. This situation may be improved with this application as the chickens can be collected from the rear of the property away from residential development. Under the circumstances, it is considered appropriate to impose a condition restricting the hours of collection until 9.00pm and 10.00pm during day light saving periods.

Traffic and Parking

This proposal will result in the generation of an additional 4 truck movements over an 8 week period. The local traffic network can adequately accommodate this minor increase. Furthermore, it is not considered that significant additional dust will be generated by this proposal.

No additional parking should be required, given the nature of this application.

Odour

The proposed expansion of the poultry farm will not generate significant additional odour. Indeed, odour could even be reduced as the chickens will be housed in less crowded conditions.

Improvement to the odour which emanates from the site can be achieved by suitable work practices involving the immediate removal of chicken manure.

Issues in relation to the storage of chicken carcasses can be rectified by covering the storage area, thus preventing access by scavenging animals and birds.

Surrounding Locality

The subject site is adjoined by a mushroom growing operation, a duck farm and rural residential development. The residential development is located in excess of 200m from the proposed extension. It is not considered that the proposed development will be out of character with the locality.

Conclusion

It is considered that the additional impacts generated by this development will not be significant. Indeed, the impacts could even be lessened as the opportunity arises to impose conditions on the development.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be approved, subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with Plans No. 1 and 2, dated 10 May 1994.
2. Submission of a building application, plans and specifications complying with the Building Code of Australia.
3. All waste materials to be stored and disposed of at regular intervals to the satisfaction of the Divisional Manager Environment and Development.
4. The submission and approval of a management plan for the removal of fowls at the end of the growing period.
5. The submission of a plan of surface water drainage for approval with the building application.
6. Submission of a sedimentation control plan for approval with the building application.
7. The chickens shall not be collected after 9.00pm or 10.00pm during daylight saving periods.
8. Fowl waste collected from the sheds shall be immediately removed from the property.
9. The carcass storage area shall be adequately secured to prevent access by scavenging birds and other animals details to be submitted with the Building Application. Dead fowls are to be removed from the property on a daily basis.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NAX.V04

****** END OF ITEM 21 ******

ITEM 22: **TYRE LANDFILL - HENDRENS ROAD, EBENEZER****FILE NUMBER:** DA347/92/GMA**REPORT:**

Council has resolved to refuse an application by East Coast Tyre Recyclers Pty Ltd proposing whole tyre landfill on land at Hendrens Road, Ebenezer adjacent to the Hawkesbury River for the following reasons:

1. It is contrary to the Draft Local Environmental Plan
2. The subject property is located below the 1 : 100 year flood frequency level and this proposal does not safeguard against the movement or escape of tyres downstream
3. The proposal will reduce the agricultural viability of the property
4. The proposal is likely to cause soil erosion and land degradation
5. The proposal is not in the public interest.

Following the Council's decision, the applicant company appealed to the Land and Environment Court. There was an attendance before the Registrar of the Court on the 5th July when the matter was listed for call over. The Court has now advised that the matter has been fixed for hearing in the Court in Sydney on the 12th and 13th September, 1994.

The original application in this matter was considered in February 1993, with approval subsequently granted in March subject to:

1. The designated road area is the only area to be used for tyre landfill
2. All topsoil is to be removed prior to the excavation in a manner to minimise erosion
3. Topsoil to be replaced each side of the raised road as soon as possible and vegetated
4. The work be carried out as set out in the application as so far as height of the road cell areas and containing of cells
5. No foreign materials to be buried in the cells
6. Operating hours to be from 7am to 5pm Monday to Friday and 7am to 12noon Saturday
7. Approval to be granted for 2 years with a review after 12 months.

In May 1993, the Director General of the Environmental Protection Authority wrote to the Council on the instruction of the Minister indicating that *"The EPA is concerned about the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposal, and intends to require the proponent to clearly justify the proposal in light of these concerns, and the foreshadowed EPA Policy which will have the effect of banning the landfilling of whole used tyres. It is intended that this approach will complement Council's decision to approve this proposal, and in this regard I would appreciate a copy of Council's Consent. Should a Certificate of Registration be issued, conditions will be placed upon the Certificate which will ensure the EPA's environmental concerns are properly addressed."*

Following that advice, the Council, in June 1993 resolved to prepare a Draft Local Environmental Plan with the aim of prohibiting the burying of motor vehicle tyres within the Hawkesbury Local Government area.

At its May Ordinary Meeting this year, as a result of an application for extension by the company the Council resolved to support this extension for an area of 8,000 square metres subject to:

1. A six monthly report on progress be presented to Council from the applicant
2. Physical restraints be placed to eliminate any possibility of tyres leaving the site to the height of a 1 : 100 year flood
3. No landfill be taken or transported to the site
4. The cells are to be placed as per the plan submitted
5. The tyres and the cells are not to exceed natural ground level

That resolution was subject to a rescission motion. The rescission motion was dealt with at the June 1994 Meeting, when it was resolved that the application not be approved. Conditions of refusal were then resolved at the July Ordinary Meeting.

Verbal advice was given at the Committee Meeting that the Council could not reverse its decision in the matter as it was within the period of three months. Council can in fact, reverse its position in matters, provided that this change comes through a report to a Committee. Accordingly, the matter is resubmitted to this meeting.

Verbal discussions in the last week indicate that the Environmental Protection Authority may have a different position in the matter to that occurring last year. Accordingly, correspondence has been forwarded to them to ascertain the position and this will be reported to the Committee.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.G21

****** END OF ITEM 22 ******

ITEM 23: HOLLANDS PADDOCK CAR PARK - COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT**FILE NUMBER:** P1408/95 PT2/GMA

REPORT:

The Windsor and District Chamber of Commerce has written as follows:

"The executive of the Windsor & District Chamber of Commerce wish to inform you that the Chamber would be very supportive of a shopping development across the area known as Hollands Car Park.

With its superior ingress/egress situation it would appear that it is at this point in time the logical location for such a development so sorely needed in the Windsor CBD and the Hawkesbury. It is understood that Council is to acquire the land from the Water Board. The Chamber would like to assist Council in any way possible to facilitate such a development."

There have been discussions on a number of occasions regarding development of the Hollands Car Park area, including a large scale proposal some years ago to establish a discount department store. Advice at that time was that the Department of Planning would not rezone the area for commercial development due to advice from the Department of Public Works about the nature of flooding. The current position with that advice has been ascertained.

There have been previous indications to adjoining land owners that redevelopment of their land with the inclusion of some of the car park area was supported, although none have proceeded with applications.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Windsor and District Chamber of Commerce be advised that previous advice to the Council has been that rezoning for large scale commercial development was unlikely and the current position with this will be ascertained. Further, that redevelopment of the properties fronting George Street, including some of the Hollands Paddock area would be supported subject to consideration of appropriate access and other development considerations.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.G19

****** END OF ITEM 23 ******

ITEM 24: DEMOLITION OF WEATHERBOARD COTTAGE - 339 WINDSOR STREET, RICHMOND

FILE NUMBER: DA281/93 PT1/GMA

REPORT:

The above cottage stands on land that is zoned residential 2(a) and is a heritage item for the purposes of the Local Environmental Plan.

When the Council first considered the matter in February it resolved that no action be taken until such time as the issue had been discussed by the Heritage Committee and that Council request a report on the matter from its Heritage Adviser.

The Heritage Committee inspected the property and advised as follows:

"The cottage on the land is important within the heritage context, not only to Richmond, but to the Hawkesbury region. The building is an unusual construction type being vertical pit sawn planks, together with adzed timber rounds. Further investigation should be undertaken. In the event that Council approves demolition, the cottage should be fully recorded prior to commencement of any work."

The Heritage Adviser inspected the site and a summary of his report is as follows:

"Given the measure of interest in retention of the cottage as a rare survivor of a slab worker's cottage dating from the mid/early 19th century it may be possible to find a purchaser who is prepared to accept conservation of the original portion of the building in return for approval to develop the rear portion of the site."

He then gave matters that would need to be addressed should the Council resolve to allow demolition.

In May, the Heritage Council of NSW advised the Council that:

- "1. On the evidence available the cottage is considered to be of State significance and to be capable of conservation;*
- 2. In its opinion your Council has not adequately considered the effect of the application on the heritage significance of the cottage, and therefore has not complied with Clause 27 (2) of the Hawkesbury LEP 1989;*
- 3. The proposed demolition of the cottage has not been adequately justified;*

4. *Your Council should request the applicant to provide a conservation plan prepared by an experienced conservation practitioner assessing the history, condition and heritage significance of the cottage and options for development of the site which might achieve its conservation;*
5. *Following receipt of the conservation plan your Council should reconsider the matter in accordance with the LEP and advise the Heritage Council of your Council's decision prior to issue of a development consent; and*
6. *If further investigations should lead to the decision to permit the demolition of the cottage, your Council is requested to include more adequate conditions requiring recording of the cottage, prior to its demolition, in accordance with the Heritage Council's guidelines "How to Prepare Archival Records of Heritage Items" for items of State heritage significance."*

Later in May, solicitors Smail Rhodes & Co., for the applicant, in summary advised the Council:

"There can be no realistic conservation plan for the cottage, short of the expenditure of a considerable amount of public monies. Should the Council seriously contemplate a determination adverse to our client's application we would envisage that our client would need not less than \$1,000,000.00 to embark on any restoration of a worthwhile nature. She would need these monies by way of grant, rather than a loan, as such capital expenditure could not possibly be reflected in time in an enhancement of the market value of the property to the extent of this investment. We would think that the Council would be loath to apply public monies in this fashion.

As an alternative of course, the Council could acquire the property. We are sure that our client would be amenable to a reasonable offer for such acquisition and the Council may be able to obtain some grant from the Heritage Council for this purpose."

The applicant also submitted a report from Robert Armstrong a registered architect whose conclusion was:

"In conclusion, I am of the opinion that the cottage in question has no significance as a heritage building and nothing will be lost to either present or future generations through its demolition. I would recommend however, that all demolished materials found to be in reasonable condition and considered to be of 19th century origins, be set aside and donated to the Hawkesbury City Council for eventual re-use in the restoration or maintenance of the many similar buildings which remain in the region."

These matters were reported to the General Purpose Committee on the 28th June, when it resolved to recommend to Council:

"That Council request the Heritage Council of New South Wales to agree to the demolition of the subject building and that should the concurrence be forthcoming then a condition of the demolition include the recording of the building prior to its demolition in accordance with the Heritage Council's guidelines "How to Prepare Archival Records of Heritage Items".

Council, at its Meeting on the 12th July resolved that:

"Council inform the property owners that the building is to be saved, and they be informed of what assistance can be given from the Heritage Committee of the Council and the Heritage Council of Australia regarding funding and whatever help and assistance can be given."

Mrs Colquhoun has now written requesting that the matter be referred to the Council's Legal Consultative Committee for review as soon as possible. With her letter she forwards a quote from Scruci Constructions for restoration in the amount of \$62,000.

The matter is referred to the full Committee of the Council as there is no legal action in hand. There is a further report in this regard to this meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council request the Heritage Council of New South Wales to agree to the demolition of the subject building and that should the concurrence be forthcoming, then a condition of the demolition include the recording of the building prior to its demolition in accordance with the Heritage Council's Guidelines *"How to Prepare Archival Records of Heritage Items."*

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.G18

****** END OF ITEM 24 ******

ITEM 25: URBAN LAND RELEASES**FILE NUMBER:** GT190/002 PT2/GMA**REPORT:**

The Council has previously adopted a plan to provide for additional urban land releases in the City within its objective of a series of towns and villages in a rural hinterland. The proposals were for sustainable growth over a period of time.

A number of factors have affected that plan, from constraints on services to community expectations.

When first adopted in the early 1980's, the plan was to provide additional urban land around the existing centres and one new area with limitations on rural subdivision. With the exception of Bligh Park, other releases have not proceeded although there has been considerable rural subdivision which has seen impact on both traffic volumes and landscape. The following is the current position with the major proposals, including the recent advice by the Water Board:

North Richmond	There was to be major extension to the town on the southern side, of which only 100 lots has proceeded to date. The remainder of the release is dependent upon water and sewerage servicing.
Richmond	An area west of Castlereagh Road was identified where this has been partly developed, with the remainder subject to water and sewerage servicing. Richmond infill. A number of opportunities for infilling Richmond were identified, these are mainly subject to requirement to augment stormwater drainage which will be undertaken this year.
Windsor	The Bligh Park and surrounding land owned by Angliss Meat Company and North Bligh Park were identified. Bligh Park has proceeded with the last stage being completed this year. Angliss Meat Company negotiated with the State Government to have part of their land dedicated as national park and the remainder a rural residential subdivision which is proceeding to completion. The north Bligh Park area has been held up for some time due to the probable maximum flood levels.
Wilberforce	An area north east of the town has been identified and this is subject to provision of reticulated sewerage.

Vineyard	A large area at Vineyard was identified as suitable for urban purposes and has twice been the subject of Council resolutions for release. It is currently held due to constraints on servicing. The Department of Planning indicating its sequential development as services arrive through the North West Sector (15-20 years) and most recently affected by the flood levels.
Scheyville	A proposal for the new town of Scheyville has not proceeded due to reconsideration of Sydney's development specifically in the North West Sector by the Department of Planning.
Pitt Town	A large area north of Pitt Town was identified as suitable for urban purposes. It has been held up to date due to the Regional Environmental Plan regarding the extraction of sand material. If this is removed, then further development will be dependent upon the provision of services, specifically water and sewerage.

Probably the most concerning position in the area at the present time is the availability of housing for Defence Service families. The Defence Housing Authority has indicated it has tried numerous locations and has been unable to obtain sufficient land for its needs. Accordingly, it has been relocating Defence Service families from the area and this is continuing. The current Urban Development Program indicates the only land remaining in Hawkesbury for development is around 200 lots, being the last stage of Bligh Park. No releases are indicated beyond this.

Representatives from the Water Board at a recent meeting indicated that the role of the Board is to maintain supply to existing customers, ensure supply to growth, investigate proposals that are supported by both the Council and the Department of Planning and to undertake long term planning. At the same time, it has been clearly stated that the provision of water supply to any individual proposal is on a strictly commercial basis. Subject to finalisation of options, the preliminary costs of augmentation by the Board is in the order of \$12 million. The Board has indicated that a report in this regard will be finalised by September.

Council has requested a meeting with the Minister for Planning and at this stage it is considered that the request should be augmented with one for support of at least sufficient release of land to enable the Defence Housing Authority to retain Defence Service families associated with the Richmond RAAF Base within the Hawkesbury Local Government area. A further report will be forwarded to the Council when the Board's final options are known and on the completion of the review of the strategic plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Minister for Planning be advised of the critical problem of land for the Defence Housing Authority to provide housing for defence families associated with the Royal Australian Air Force Base at Richmond and the current action of relocating them some distance from their work place. Further, that the support of the Member for Hawkesbury and the Member for Londonderry be sought in this matter.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.G17

****** END OF ITEM 25 ******

ITEM 26: **TREE REMOVAL - PROSPECT ELECTRICITY****FILE NUMBER:** GE010/004PT02/EVD

Council at its meeting of 11th February 1992 considered a report with a recommendation "that Prospect Electricity be advised that Council no longer requires applications for Council's consent under the Tree Preservation for lopping of trees in accordance with their works, however, will continue to do so where trees are required to be removed". The Council, however, did not adopt this recommendation and resolved as follows:

"That there be a review with Prospect on the pruning of ornamental trees in the City area".

Since that time a number of discussions have taken place to the extent where Prospect has now written as follows:

"I am writing to bring you up to date on developments in relation to street trees and power lines and to seek your input on the contentious aspect of removing or replacing selected trees with more suitable species. In this regard, a moratorium on removal of street trees by Prospect has been in place since February 1993..."

Prospect has formed the first Community Environmental Liaison Committee (CELC) at Fairfield to work closely with the Council, its staff and community members in order to find solutions to tree management problems. We have been developing principles on tree management to create balanced, treed landscapes so that power lines and trees can exist in harmony.

We will be working over the next year, with your co-operation, to establish CELCs in every local council area.

If you agree, proposals for tree replacement will be subject to the approval of the CELC. In the meantime the Environment Protection Authority will be informed of contentious aspects of our tree management programs including any tree removals to be carried out in co-operation with your Council.

You will also be aware that the Board of Prospect has allocated an additional \$14 million in 1993/94 for environmental enhancement projects such as replacement of open-wire construction with aerial bundled cable in heavily treed streets and selective undergrounding in commercial areas, on major traffic routes and in heritage areas. Although this program is now well advanced for 1993/94, Prospect will be looking for advice from CELCs to set priorities and identify opportunities for future investment which is both cost-effective and environmentally beneficial.

Other features of Prospect's environmental management for the 1990's include:-

- . a published Environmental Policy with provisions including visual impact and trees*
- . environmental assessment procedures to ensure our activities comply with the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act*
- . environmental training for Prospect's employees and contractors*
- . training at the Ryde School of Horticulture for tree trimmers*
- . either underground or aerial bundled cable construction for new or replacement lines under 22,000 volts*

I am now seeking your comments on these matters and, in particular, your views on the appropriateness of re-introducing a tree removal or replacement program."

In order to meet statutory obligations under the "Electricity (Overhead Line Safety) Regulation 1991", Prospect Electricity does not, in statutory terms, require Council approval to undertake overhead line maintenance although, in most instances where ornamental trees are involved, applications for regular maintenance work is often made, and where appropriate the necessary work approved for compliance with standard safety factors.

Notwithstanding this undertaking, it has been found that in some locations inappropriate trees have either been planted or grown naturally, causing interference with electricity supply, making it necessary in some instances to recommend removal of one or several trees in the location. In previous cases of this nature removal has been considered as a last resort and is sanctioned only if any other action is considered detrimental to the condition, shape, or well-being of the tree.

It is considered that there may be some merit in the establishment of a Community Environment Liaison Committee and that further discussions should take place with Prospect in this respect. In the meantime, however, it is considered that there is a need for the re-introduction of a tree removal/replacement program, and this is included in the recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION:

- A. Prospect Electricity be advised that there would be no objection to the re-introduction of a tree removal or replacement program as requested subject to the following conditions:-
1. Prior to any tree removal being undertaken, an application be submitted and approved by this office, removal costs to be borne by applicant.
 2. A minimum of 1 (one) replacement tree is to be provided for each tree removed subject to the discretion of the inspecting officer, replacement trees to be provided and planted at cost of applicant.

3. Where it is found that it is impractical to undertake complete removal, the offending tree or trees be ground lined and the resulting residue stump growth be treated with the weedicide "Round Up" as a deterrent to regrowth.
- B. That Prospect Electricity be invited to have discussions with Council concerning the merits and workings of a Community Environmental Liaison Committee with regard to tree management issues in respect of Prospect Electricity's undertakings.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.V01

****** END OF ITEM 26 ******

ITEM 27: RE-INSTATEMENT OF AFTER HOURS COURTESY KENNELS**FILE NUMBER:** GE020/002/EVD

REPORT:

This matter was raised by Councillor Keegan in questions without notice and it was advised that a report would be submitted to this meeting.

Recently the after hours courtesy kennels at the dog pound were demolished. These kennels could be used to deposit dogs and cats 24 hours per day. Located near the front door, the wastewater from the kennels posed a public health nuisance as the public walked through it to gain entry to the reception area. The kennels were also unsupervised after hours and there were instances of injury and death to animals caused by fighting. During a six week period, the pound was broken into twice and the location of these kennels made easy access to the roof area from which entry was gained. A further issue with the use of courtesy kennels is Council's liability in the instance of the unlawful placement of dogs, eg, dogs belonging to other people.

Despite these problems the courtesy kennels have potential to provide a needed and humane service for handling unwanted dogs and cats. The unfortunate alternative is a likely increase in the incidence of dumping unwanted pets with the attendant adverse environmental and public health impacts.

An improved arrangement for the operation of the "courtesy kennels" would be to locate them at a site which is staffed on a seven day per week basis. This would allow ready access and provide some needed supervision. Whilst the office hours of the pound have recently been extended to 9.30 - 12 noon and 4.00 pm - 5.00 pm Monday to Friday and 9.30am - 10.30am Saturday, they are not sufficiently long to obviate the need for the courtesy kennels.

A more satisfactory arrangement may be to site them at the South Windsor Waste Depot as it is supervised on a 7 day per week basis. Any animals could be picked up and transferred to the pound on a daily basis to avoid the nuisance of dogs barking at night.

It is proposed to discuss the possibility of siting a number of "courtesy" kennels at Waste Depot with the contractor. The arrangements would involve the contractor supervising the kennels. It is not proposed that any person surrendering an dog or cat be required to pay a fee.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.V11

****** END OF ITEM 27 ******

ITEM 28: WEATHERBOARD COTTAGE - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO
DEMOLISH - 80 LENNOX STREET, RICHMOND - V & P
TCHADOVITCH**FILE NUMBER:** P515/135/EVD**REPORT:**

Council at its Ordinary Meeting on 12 July 1994 resolved the following in relation to an application made pursuant to Section 68 of the Local Government Act 1993 for the demolition of a cottage on the land:-

"That the matter be deferred to allow the applicant to address the Council."

Since Council's resolution, a meeting has been held with the applicants to discuss a proposal involving retention of the cottage, and its adaptive reuse as commercial office space and construction of a villa at the rear of the cottage. The availability of funding for a traditional colour scheme for the weatherboard cottage and timber picket fence was also discussed with the applicants.

At the meeting, the applicants indicated that their original intention had been to develop the "L" shaped land in two stages; Stage I involving the construction of three villas (2 x 2 bedroom villas and 1 x 3 bedroom villa) and Stage II involving the demolition of the weatherboard cottage and construction of a further two villas.

Development consent for the three Stage I villas was issued on 16 September 1993 and the villas are currently half constructed. To date, however, no application for the Stage II villas has been lodged. It is doubtful whether approval would in fact be issued for the Stage II villas given the limited area of the remainder of the site and the requirements of Council's Medium Density Housing Development Control Plan.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the applicants requested additional time to adequately consider the proposal and obtain quotations for the refurbishment of the cottage. The applicants further indicated that they would advise Council in writing of their response to the proposal before the August General Purpose Committee Meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the report be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.V13

****** END OF ITEM 28 ******

ITEM 29: THE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT ACT, 1979
 - AMENDMENTS**FILE NUMBER:** GC070/006 PT2/EVD

REPORT:

On 13 May 1994, the Environmental Planning and Assessment (Amendment) Act 1994 and the Local Government Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 1994 were both passed by Parliament. These Acts have resulted in changes to various sections of the Environmental Planning and Assessment (E P & A) Act 1979 which became effective on 1 July 1994. The major amendments are summarised below:

A Environmental Planning and Assessment (Amendment) Act 1994

1. Section 45 - Consultation in the preparation of a draft regional environmental plan

The Act now clearly defines the extent of the obligation of the Director of Planning to consult a Council, public authority or person in the preparation of a regional environmental study or a draft regional environmental plan. The Director must consider any comments from those consulted which are received within 40 days of the Director's information being sent. This then completes the consultation process.

2. Section 91 - Performance based conditions of consent

Explicit power is now given under Section 91(3B) to express conditions of consent as performance based conditions. Previously the power to express performance based conditions of consent in Section 91(3) was not clear. Some consents had already been issued in these terms but were potentially in danger of being ruled invalid as there was no explicit provision in the EP & A Act to put the use of performance based conditions of consent beyond doubt. A savings provision has also been included in the amendment to extend the power of Section 91(3B) to performance based conditions imposed prior to the amendment.

A performance based condition is one which identifies:

- a. one or more express outcomes or objectives that a development must achieve; and
- b. clear criteria against which achievement of the outcome or objective must be assessed.

An example would be a condition which requires that a development meet certain noise criteria to minimise the impact on surrounding residents. The condition may, but does not necessarily have to, specify the means by which the outcome or objective will be achieved.

3. Section 91A - Determination of Crown development applications

The whole of Section 91A has been repealed and replaced with a new Section 91A which introduces a new procedure for the determination of development applications made by Crown authorities under the Act. In addition clause 41B of the EP & A Regulation 1980 has been repealed. The new clause 41B details those persons whose development applications are affected by Section 91A. They include a public authority (not being a Council), a public utility, a university or technical college and the Totalizator Agency Board.

The new Section 91A continues to limit the power of a consent authority to refuse or impose conditions on development applications made by or on behalf of the Crown, without the written approval of the Minister. However, the procedure by which a Crown application may be referred to the Minister for determination has changed. The procedure is summarised Figure 1 attached. This procedure also applies when approval is sought to modify a Crown consent.

B. Local Government Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 1994.

1. Section 56 - Appointment of qualified person

Section 56 which requires Council employees preparing a draft local environmental plan or a study to have prescribed environmental planning qualifications is deleted. It will now be up to Councils to ensure that a suitably qualified person is employed in accordance with Chapter 11 of the Local Government Act 1993.

2. Section 91AA - "In Principle" consent

"In Principle" consents under Section 91AA and Section 97 will in future be known as "deferred commencement" consents to more accurately reflect their true nature. This effects no substantive change to these sections, but makes it clear that the approval does not commence immediately.

3. Section 151 - Delegation by Councils

The power under Section 151 which enables Councils to delegate functions has been removed and in the future, internal delegations by Councils will be dealt with wholly under Chapter 12 Part 3 of the Local Government Act 1993. From July 1 1994 any existing delegations from the Director of Planning are taken to be conferred on Council and Section 381 of the Local Government Act applies.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information relating to recent amendments to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

AT-1 Figure 1: Procedure for the consideration of a Crown DA.

FN:EN726NBX.V02

****** END OF ITEM 29 ******

ITEM 30: ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT REGULATION
1980 - CHANGES TO SCHEDULE 3 - DESIGNATED DEVELOPMENT**FILE NUMBER:** GT090/001 PT2, LEP8/91 PT1/EVD**REPORT:**

At its Ordinary meeting of 14 September 1993, Council resolved that a submission be forwarded to the Department of Planning in regard to its discussion paper concerning Schedule 3 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 1980 - Designated Development. Designated developments are those which because of their potential environmental impacts are required to be the subject of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The submission to the Department addressed 9 of the 32 categories of development including:

1. agriculture;
2. concrete plants - batching and products;
3. crushing, grinding and milling works;
4. livestock intensive industries;
5. extractive industries;
6. oil refinery or petroleum storage and processing;
7. sewage treatment works;
8. turf farming
9. waste disposal.

The remaining categories of development were not addressed, given that such developments are rarely proposed in the City.

At the meeting, Council also resolved to include "mushroom composting" in the list of designated development.

The amendments to Schedule 3 were gazetted on 17 June 1994 and became effective from 1 July 1994. In the original schedule, the criteria for determining when an EIS was required focussed almost entirely on the type and size of the development. The amended schedule, however, broadens the criteria to include locational factors such as the sensitivity of the receiving environment, cumulative impacts and performance criteria.

The amended schedule includes the following major changes:

thresholds have been increased in appropriate categories to reflect past experience with implementation;

locational, performance and cumulative factors have been introduced into thresholds so the sensitivity of the receiving environment will be considered;

development categories have been re-defined and re-arranged, with some general categories being separated into a number of more specific categories to improve clarity;

for development involving alterations and additions to existing development, Council must consider the changes in overall environmental impact (not just size and scale) in deciding if the proposal is designated.

Under the previous schedule, Council, applicants and the community could refer to Schedule 3 without reference to the proposed site to determine if a development was designated. Whilst this will still be the case for developments which are larger than the scale threshold, for small to medium sized developments, applicants will now need to provide Council with details on the proposed site and surrounding area at the initial enquiry stage to determine if a development requires an EIS.

The Department intends to produce a series of guidelines or best practice notes to assist in making the environmental impact assessment process more effective and efficient.

The Department also recommends that development applications for those types of developments in Schedule 3 which are not designated, should continue to be advertised for a minimum of 14 days.

In relation to Council's submission on Schedule 3 of the Regulation, the following summary is provided. In those circumstances where Council's comments were not included in the amendments, further comment is made.

1. Agricultural Produce Industries

Industries which:

process greater than 30,000 tonnes/annum
discharge effluent or sludge into or within 100m of a waterbody or wetlands.

Comment:

Council supported this amendment.

2. Concrete Works

Works which:

produce greater than 30,000 tonnes/annum
located within 250m of a residential zone or 100m of a waterbody.

Comment:

Council supported this amendment.

3. Crushing, Grinding or Separating Works

Works which process sand, gravel, rock, minerals or demolition material and;

handle greater than 30,000 tonnes/annum
located within 500m of a residential zone or 250m of a dwelling.

Comment:

The draft amendments to Schedule 3 proposed a two level threshold for crushing, grinding or separating works. The threshold for works undertaken wholly within an enclosed building or located within a mine was to be 30,000 tonnes per annum; and for works not wholly within an enclosed building, 20,000 tonnes per annum. Council submitted that the threshold of 20,000 tonnes per annum would restrict the consideration of development which may be of a significant size or scale to give rise to environmental or community concerns. Further, it was submitted that thresholds may not always be the most appropriate way of considering potential impact.

The Department subsequently indicated that as a Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) would still need to be prepared for developments which are not designated, the environmental impacts of small to medium crushing, grinding or separating works could still be properly assessed.

4. Extractive Industries

Industries which excavate, dredge, tunnel, quarry, stockpile or process extractive material and

handle greater than 30,000 tonnes/annum
disturb greater than 2ha
located in or within 40m of a waterbody or protection zone, 200m of a coastline, in acid sulphate soils or where the slope is greater than 18 degrees from the horizontal
if involving blasting, located within 1,000m of a residential zone or 500m of a dwelling
located within 500m of other extractive industries.

Comment:

Whilst the designation now alleviates the financial burden for minor extractive operations to produce an EIS, Council submitted that the size of an extractive operation or its proximity to a waterbody or residential area is not an adequate indication of the degree of environmental impact of such an operation. It was recommended that extractive operations which disturb less than 2ha of land, may require an EIS at the discretion of the consent authority, since local councils are more familiar with the probable impacts of such operations in a particular locality.

The Department advised that as there was generally wide support for the 2ha threshold from industry, government, councils and the community, the threshold was retained. Further, because locational factors such as distance from watercourses, wetlands, protection zones, or dwellings are included in the designation, an EIS for smaller operations would still be necessary for those developments within sensitive environments.

5. Livestock Intensive Industries

Industries including:

feedlots for greater than 1,000 cattle, 4,000 sheep or 400 horses

piggeries for greater than 200 pigs or 20 breeding sows if located:

- in an area of high watertable, acid sulphate, sodic or saline soils within a drinking water catchment, within 100m of a waterbody
- within 5km of residential zone and are likely to significantly affect the amenity of the neighbourhood

piggeries for greater than 2,000 pigs or 200 breeding sows

poultry farms: commercial shedded or free range farms which are located:

- within 100m of a waterbody or 500m of an existing poultry farm
- within 500m of a residential zone or 150m of a dwelling and likely to significantly affect the amenity of the neighbourhood

Comment:

Council supported the inclusion of poultry farms, however suggested that a threshold be stipulated.

The Department advised that size was not a good indication for levels of impact. During the review process, it was consistently pointed out that poultry farming is an industry where location and management practices are more critical than size in determining whether there is likely to be significant environmental impacts. Often the larger farms have very sophisticated environmental management practices, whereas some small to medium size operations may cause more significant impacts than the larger, better managed operations, particularly with regard to waste disposal.

6. Petroleum Works

Works which:

produce crude petroleum or shale oil
produce greater than 5 petrajoules/annum of natural gas or methane
refine petroleum, oil or gas or manufacture greater than 100 tonnes of petroleum products
store greater than 2,000 tonnes of petroleum liquids or solids or 200 tonnes of liquefied gases
dispose of or reprocess greater than 20 tonnes of oil or petroleum waste.

Comment:

Council supported this amendment.

7. Sewerage Systems or Works

Works which:

treat sewage and
process greater than 2,500 person equivalent capacity/day
process greater than 20 person equivalent/day and are located on a floodplain or coastal dune field
store sewage, sludge or effluent:
- greater than 1,000 tonnes of material
- located in an area of high watertable, within a drinking water catchment, on a floodplain, within 100m of a waterbody or within 250m of a dwelling
incinerate sewage
discharge or reuse greater than 20 persons equivalent/day of sewage effluent or sludge:
- in an area of high watertable, acid sulphate, sodic or saline soils, within a waterbody, protection zone, catchment of a partly closed estuary, floodplain or a drinking water catchment, within 100m of a waterbody, or if the slope is greater than 6 degrees from the horizontal
- within 50m of a residential zone or 250m of a dwelling.

Comment:

The draft amendments to Schedule 3 originally proposed a threshold of 30kl per day (or 100 person equivalent capacity) for all sewerage treatment works. Council submitted that the setting of a threshold was inappropriate, if lesser sized systems can dispose of effluent onto land or water where the potential for environmental impacts are present.

It was recommended that the designation should extend to all disposal into natural waterways and should include at the discretion of the consent authority, the ability to designate where necessary.

The Department's gazetted amendment is considered to be a substantial improvement on the draft amendment as it now includes locational criteria which take into account the sensitivity of the environment.

8. Turf Farms

Farms which are likely to significantly affect the environment because of the location

in area of high watertable, within a drinking water catchment or 100m of a waterbody within 250m of other turf farms.

Comment:

Council was concerned that the draft amendments would mean considerable expense to the turf growing industry in the Hawkesbury. The major concern in relation to turf farming is nutrients entering watercourses. Council submitted that it may be more appropriate to licence turf farms, with the Environment Protection Authority monitoring water pollution if it is a problem.

The Department advised that the designation of turf farming allows Council the discretion to designate operations which based on their merits, are likely to cause significant impacts. The Department indicated that during the review, the need for environmental management standards and best practice industry codes was highlighted. In September 1993, an inter-departmental committee with local government industry and community representatives was established to develop turf industry guidelines to assist industry and aid Councils in assessing turf farming proposals. These guidelines are expected to be available shortly for public comment.

9. Waste Management Facilities or Works

Facilities which

incinerate, landfill, store or dispose of:

- any dangerous substances
- 1,000 tonnes of sludge or effluent
- greater than 200 tonnes/annum of other substances

sort, consolidate or temporary store at transfer station or materials recycling facility:

- any dangerous substances
- greater than 10,000 tonnes/annum of wastes containing food and organic substances
- greater than 30,000 tonnes/annum of other wastes

process greater than 5,000 tonnes/annum of organic solid or liquid waste

place greater than 100,000 tonnes of 'clean fill' so as to cause significant drainage or flooding impacts

are located:

- in an area of high watertable, on a floodplain, dune field, catchment of partly closed estuary, within a drinking water catchment, on permeable soils, within 100m of a waterbody or protection zone
- within 500m of a residential zone or 250m of a dwelling and likely to significantly affect the amenity of the environment.

Comment:

Council supported this amendment.

10. Mushroom Composting

The issue regarding the inclusion of including mushroom composting in the list of designated development was not addressed in the review of Schedule 3.

Whilst a further submission could be made to the Department of Planning in this regard, Council is reminded that in 1992, a draft local environmental plan was prepared, which sought to include mushroom composting as designated development. At the times the Director of Planning, decided not to issue a Section 65 Certificate to allow the draft plan to be exhibited for the following reasons:

- a. Mushroom Composting is not consistent with other industries included in Schedule 3 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act Regulation.
- b. The odour associated with the activity relates more to an issue of amenity rather than representing a significant environmental impact.
- c. The designation of the activity only within Hawkesbury City is not warranted.
- d. Clause 32 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act Regulation, 1980 provides Council with the opportunity to request any additional information it may require in determining development applications for mushroom composting.
- e. Section 30(4) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, allows Council to incorporate a provision in a Draft Local Environmental Plan which would require the advertising of development applications for mushroom composting.
- f. An appropriate Development Control Plan is the most suitable mechanism for addressing the issues raised by Council.

It is presumed that for similar reasons, mushroom composting has not been included in the Schedule for designated development.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.V20

****** END OF ITEM 30 ******

ITEM 31: SHOPPING CENTRE PROPOSAL - PAGET, WINDSOR AND EAST MARKET STREETS, RICHMOND**FILE NUMBER:** P1343.212/10 PT1/EVD

REPORT:**Background**

At its meeting of 14 December 1993, Council resolved that:

- "1. *a Draft Local Environmental Plan be prepared for the shopping centre proposal at March, Paget, Lennox and East Market Streets, Richmond; and the shopping centre proposal at Francis Street, Richmond; and*
2. *a Retail Strategy Study, by an independent consultant, be commissioned for the whole of the Hawkesbury City and Council defer any further consideration of the 2 (two) proposals until receipt of the Retail Strategy Study."*

Further, at its meeting of 8 March 1994, Council considered a report on the processing of the draft local environmental plans as they relate to the retail strategy study. The essence of Council's later resolution was that the draft local environmental plan process for the two shopping centre proposals should still proceed. This would then reduce the time taken for a decision to be made on both proposals.

The retail strategy study is due to be completed in October.

Proposal

A submission for a third shopping centre proposal at Richmond has now been received from Hely and Horne Stuart and Perry Architects; for land generally bounded by Paget, Windsor and East Market Streets and the Richmond Railway line. The subject land is held by three separate landowners, the major owners being the State Rail Authority and Elap Pty Ltd.

The proposal involves the construction of a discount department store of approximately 1,000m², a supermarket of about 2,500m² and approximately 2,650m² of specialty shop floor space. Two options have been submitted in relation to parking. The first is to provide parking for 270 vehicles, 162 at ground level and 108 at a second level. Access to the car park would be from Paget Street. Sixty five spaces would be provided for commuter parking, with access proposed from East Market Street. The existing commuter car park currently contains 90 spaces.

The second option also proposes to provide 270 parking spaces at two levels for the development, with access from Paget Street. However, in relation to commuter facilities, 56 parking spaces at two levels are proposed, as well as a bus interchange facility. Access to the commuter car park and interchange would be from East Market Street.

Based on Council's recently amended Car Parking Development Control Plan, 277 spaces are required for the shopping development.

Loading areas are also proposed, which will be accessed from Paget Street.

Statutory Situation

The majority of the site is zoned General Business 3(a) under the provisions of Hawkesbury LEP 1989 (Amendment No. 6). The amendment provides that Council shall not grant consent to development in the vicinity of the Richmond Railway Station unless it is satisfied that provision is made for:

- a. adequate shopper and commuter car parking;*
- b. a bus/rail interchange;*
- c. the design of the development being compatible with the railway station and its surroundings; and*
- d. sufficient curtilage in relation to and around the railway station.*

The remaining land is zoned Special Business 3(b), which prohibits the use of the land for shops. Accordingly, this part of the site will need to be rezoned if the development is to proceed.

Planning Comments

The architects for the proposed development acknowledge that they are unable to lodge a formal application with Council until such time as the owner's consent from the State Rail Authority is given. The Authority, however, has indicated that it will not issue its consent, if Council considers that the proposal does not have merit. Accordingly, some indication as to whether the proposal does have merit is requested by the architects so that negotiations with the State Rail Authority can commence. Should Council consider that the development has merit, it will be necessary to clearly indicate to the architects that this does not mean that Council support for the preparation of a draft local environmental plan will be forthcoming. A decision on the preparation of a draft plan will be subject to further detailed assessment and to some extent, consideration of the retail strategy study. In this regard, it is considered that the findings of the retail study are not likely to substantially impact on this proposal, given that the majority of the site is already zoned General Business 3(a).

It is also important that a curtilage around the Richmond railway station be determined. In this regard, further advice from Council's Heritage Adviser is being sought.

In locational terms the site does have some merit, as it is adjacent to public transport and its development will assist in consolidating the existing commercial centre. Further, a large part of the site is already zoned General Business 3(a), and it is not fragmented in terms of ownership. Accordingly, further discussions with the State Rail Authority would be worthwhile and should be encouraged.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That an appropriate curtilage around the Richmond Railway Station be determined by Council's Heritage Adviser.
2. That the architects of the proposed development be advised that Council considers that the proposal has some merit and as such further discussions with the State Rail Authority should be undertaken. This advice however does not necessarily mean that Council support for the preparation of a draft local environmental plan over the site will be forthcoming.
3. That the architects attention be directed to the shortfall in off street carparking and Council's desire to ensure that the parking provision complies with its DCP as well as providing for the current and projected demand for commuter parking.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.V10

****** END OF ITEM 31 ******

GENERAL PURPOSE COMMITTEE - ENVIRONMENT

Meeting Date: **26 July 1994**

Item: **32**

ITEM 32: MUSHROOM COMPOSTERS PTY LTD - POST OFFICE ROAD, EBENEZER

FILE NUMBER: P1609.110 PT8/EVD

REPORT:

The period granted to Mushroom Composters Pty Ltd by the Land & Environment Court to cease using its premises in Post Office Road, Ebenezer, so as to interfere with the amenity of the neighbourhood in respect of smell, expired on 20 May 1994.

Residents have been maintaining diaries which indicate that offensive odour from the development has been experienced by at least one resident on all but one day between 21 May 1994 and 1 July 1994. Verbal advice has been received that the odour has not diminished since 1 July 1994.

The occurrence of the odour is more frequent than what would be reasonably expected as "accidents and mishaps" as mentioned previously by the Chief Judge of the Land and Environment Court.

A development application was submitted by the company on 7 July 1994, to establish composting premises at Tinda Creek, and is being assessed.

The Environmental Defender's Office Pty Ltd, which acts for the Ebenezer Concerned Residents, advised the Solicitors for Mushroom Composters Pty Ltd on 3 June 1994 and 23 June 1994 that offensive odours continued to be emitted from the property.

The matter has been discussed with Council's Solicitors, who will be instructed to commence proceedings for Contempt of Court immediately after the General Purpose Committee Meeting.

It is understood that the contempt motion would be heard by the Chief Judge and if proven, any penalty would be at her discretion.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.V09

**** END OF ITEM 32 ****

ITEM 33: INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN**FILE NUMBER:** DCP1/93/EVD**REPORT:**

At its Ordinary Meeting of 9th March, 1993, Council resolved to amend the landscaping requirements of its Industrial Development Control Plan. The amendments to the DCP were to improve the maintenance and appearance of industrial areas by removing the requirements for industrialists to mandatorily provide landscaping beyond their inclination or their ability to maintain. These amendments were subsequently made to the DCP making as a minimum requirement for new industrial development the grassing of non-paved areas.

Following the public exhibition of the amended DCP it was further resolved by Council at its Ordinary Meeting of 13th April, 1993, in a Notice of Motion:

"A. That Council investigate amending the Industrial Development Control Plan in accordance with certain principles of urban consolidation and "Green Street" in order to achieve, in industrial areas, more efficient use of public and private lands and improved streetscapes.

B. That a report be brought forward concerning detailed aspects and implications of these amendments, such as:

New and existing services

Street parking for cars and trucks

Street landscaping

Funding of initial works and of recurrent costs

Places where these amendments would be inappropriate

Treatment of building facades."

Principally, the concept of "Green Street" when applied to industrial development could allow for reduced building setbacks, maximisation of site coverage, creation of amenity and provision of on-street parking for customers and trucks.

Conceptually the ability to introduce on-street vehicular parking and reduce building set backs provides some positive elements into industrial streetscape design namely, staggered building line, varying street width and amenity. However, whilst this concept may be beneficial, the implementation raises several concerns given that Council's industrial areas have such characteristics as services already in place, industrial areas close to residential areas and road widths of 13m carriageway with 7m footpath.

Given these characteristics, it is conceivable that development employing the "Green Street" principles would require the following:-

the re-development of existing industrial roads;

the relocation of existing services;

Council assuming the responsibility and cost of maintaining the carriageway and parking, placing a burden on Council's maintenance funding; and

the provision of additional parking signs and maintenance of markings.

Furthermore, this would have the following major repercussions in industrial areas:-

1. Transfer of cost of suitable road reconstruction, parking construction and service relocation from the developer to the subdivider.
2. Conflict between pedestrians and commuters if footpaths are resumed.
3. Limited number of parking spaces could be provided on street. Consequently some parking may still be required to be provided on-site to meet Council's parking code. This could result in the inefficient use of space on site when truck manoeuvrability and loading and unloading bays are taken into consideration.
4. In existing industrial estates, parking could only be provided on one side of the road due to the road width. However, inequity would arise as the "first in best dressed" principle would have to apply.

In general terms, the provision of on-street parking is inappropriate given the advanced stage of Council's industrial areas. Furthermore, the financial burden of providing the standard of carriageway construction outweighs the benefits of amenity that could be achieved. The opportunity to introduce some of these concepts into new industrial estates, which can be appropriately designed from the start should not be eliminated. However, consideration needs to be given to improving the appearance of existing industrial areas.

Whilst the amendment to the Industrial DCP regarding the removal of all landscaping requirements for industrialists has been exhibited, investigations into the cost imposition of providing minimal landscaping on the front building set backs have been carried out. These investigations indicate that landscaping during building construction offers a cost effective alternative to introducing "Green Street principles" such as on-street parking or costly building facade treatment to add amenity. The following table provides an example of low maintenance landscaping.

LOW MAINTENANCE LANDSCAPING 30 METRES WIDE INDUSTRIAL SITE		
Proposed Standard	Cost	Comment
* 1 Advance tree/5m	6 x \$10-\$15 Total Cost = \$90	Total Cost includes buy, supply and plant.
* 1 Shrub/3m (building frontage 21m)	7 x \$10-\$15 Total Cost = \$105	Total cost includes buy, supply and plant.
* Turf and grassing	\$1,000	Total cost includes buy, supply and lay.
* Watering system		Cost depends on choice of system.
Total Cost	\$1,500 - \$2,000	

In comparative terms the cost of providing the above low maintenance landscaping equates to 1 - 2 % of total construction cost of industrial buildings. If appropriate watering systems and low maintenance landscaping is provided during building construction the appearance and amenity of existing industrial estates could be improved substantially.

Given the above, it is recommended that low maintenance landscaping be re-introduced into the Industrial DCP along with a suitable list of low maintenance trees and shrubs.

Further, whilst reduced building setbacks can be achieved in existing industrial estates it is considered that they would be best dealt with on a merits based approach.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Industrial DCP be amended to:-

1. incorporate low maintenance landscaping; and
2. permit a merits based approach to building setbacks.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:EN726NBX.V08

**** END OF ITEM 33 ****