

HAWKESBURY CITY COUNCIL ORDINARY MEETING

Where People Make the Difference!

BUSINESS PAPER

DATE OF MEETING: 12 December 1995

LOCATION: Council Chambers

TIME: 7.30pm

This business paper has been reproduced electronically to reduce costs, improve efficiency and reduce the use of paper. Internal control systems ensure it is an accurate reproduction of Council's official copy of the business paper.

ORDINARY MEETING

Table of Contents

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Page 2

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
------	---------	------

AGENDA

-	Prayer	
-	Apologies	
-	SECTION 1 - Minutes of Meetings	
	Ordinary - 14 November 1995	
	Special - 30 November 1995	
	No Mayoral Minutes Were Submitted	
-	SECTION 2 - Notices of Motion	
	Notices of Motion	11
	Notices of Motion of Rescission	13
-	SECTION 3 - Report of the General Purpose Committee	
76:	STOCKPILING OF MANURE AND SAWDUST FROM POULTRY FARMS - LOT 4 DP239897 NO. 137 COMMERCIAL ROAD, VINEYARD DA154/89/EVD	15
77:	HOME ACTIVITY - WHOLESALE VEHICLE DEALER'S LICENCE - LOT 11 DP248509 238 COMMERCIAL ROAD, OAKVILLE DA237/95/EVD	17
78:	FUNCTION HALL - USE OF EXISTING BUILDING - LOT 12 DP834771 NO. 99 GADDS LANE, NORTH RICHMOND DA154/95/EVD	19
79:	TENNIS COMPLEX - PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION - LOT 1 DP843500 NO. 42 CANOONA AVENUE, WINDSOR DOWNS DA238/95/EVD	21
80:	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN THE GREATER METROPOLITAN REGION - DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND PLANNING GT150/003 PT3/EVD	22
81:	HOME ACTIVITY - TUTORING, TRANSLATING, CONSULTANCY & ORGANISING THE EXPORT OF AGRICULTURAL GOODS - LOT 8 SP21885 NO. 8/5 PAGET STREET, RICHMOND DA208/95/EVD	23

ORDINARY MEETING**Table of Contents****Meeting Date:** 12 December 1995**Page** 3

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
82:	TRUCK DEPOT - PARKING OF THREE FURNITURE TRUCKS ON AN OVERNIGHT BASIS - PT POR 451 PARISH WILBERFORCE BURGESS ROAD, FREEMANS REACH DA220/95/EVD	25
83:	TREE CLEARING PROPOSAL FOR A MARKET GARDEN - LOT 12 DP588380 NO. 133 TERRACE ROAD, NORTH RICHMOND DA0155/95PT01; P2003/95PT01/EVD	26
84:	CLEARING OF LAND FOR RABBIT AND FIRE CONTROL - LOT 12 DP846650 TIZZANA ROAD, EBENEZER DA0115/95 PT01/GMA	29
85:	TREE REMOVAL APPLICATION - LOT 1 DP743221 NO. 119 SHEPHERDS ROAD, GLOSSODIA - APPLICANT: MR & MRS P MIFSUD P1904/100/EVD	30
86:	TREE REMOVAL AGRICULTURE - LOT 6 DP239897 NO. 153 COMMERCIAL ROAD, VINEYARD - APPLICANT: MR J SULTANA P361/590/EVD	31
87:	OUR CITY OUR FUTURE - RECOMMENDATION NO. 1 RURAL LANDS STUDY GT225/013 PT02/EVD	32
88:	FLOODPLAIN PLANNING GC180/006PT02/EVD	32
89:	SOLAR EFFICIENCY DCP3/95/EVD	33
90:	DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 15/94 - PT LOT 6 DP39166 & LOT 1 DP563924 CNR PITT TOWN & WOLSELEY ROADS, McGRATHS HILL - APPLICANT: GRAHAM PRICE PTY LTD LEP15/94/EVD	33
91:	GRAHAM PRICE PTY LTD - MUSHROOM COMPOSTING - 100 PITT TOWN ROAD, MCGRATHS HILL (CORNER WOLSELEY ROAD) P1641/700 PT02/EVD	33
92:	REZONING PROPOSAL TO ALLOW 36 RURAL/RESIDENTIAL LOTS, VINCENTS ROAD, KURRAJONG - TEERMAN & NEWTON PTY LTD P2203/380 PT02/EVD	34

ORDINARY MEETING**Table of Contents****Meeting Date:** 12 December 1995**Page** 4

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
93:	NOISE CONTROL REGULATION 1975 - COMPLAINTS CONCERNING BARKING DOGS - DON STREET, KURRAJONG. P413/50 PT01; P413/20 PT01; GE020/004/EVD	34
94:	TWO LOT SUBDIVISION TO SEVER EXISTING DWELLINGS UNDER STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY NO.1 - LOT 16 DP 192412 m 1 MADDENS ROAD, NORTH RICHMOND. SA0134/95PT01/EVD	35
95:	SUBDIVISION TO CREATE FIVE ALLOTMENTS WITH BUILDING ENTITLEMENTS PLUS A SIXTH COMMUNITY LOT - LOT 18 DP 30468, m 26 CLIFF ROAD, FREEMANS REACH. SA0106/95/EVD	36
96:	TOURIST/RECREATION RESORT AND COMMUNITY TITLE SUBDIVISION PROPOSAL - "THE RIDGE", WISEMANS FERRY ROAD, CATTAI GT090/003PT07/EVD	36
97:	TREE CLEARING PROPOSAL FOR A MARKET GARDEN - LOT 12 DP588380 m 133 TERRACE ROAD, NORTH RICHMOND - MICALLEF DA0155/95PT01;P2003/95PT01/EVD	36
13:	MACQUARIE STREET, WINDSOR - CLEARWAY RESTRICTION 1341/R PT03/ENG	37
18:	MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS - OCTOBER 1995 GF011/005 PT04/FNC	38
19:	MASONIC LODGE PROPERTY - WEST MARKET STREET, RICHMOND P2338/105 PT01/CSV	38
-	SECTION 4 - Reports for Determination	
116:	HAWKESBURY NEPEAN CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT TRUST - REVIEW GR060/067 PT01/GMA	41
117:	WINDSOR RUGBY LEAGUE COMPLEX - PROCEEDS OF SALE GC283/032 PT2/CSV	44
118:	COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF CAR PARK LAND - BAKER STREET, WINDSOR P732/140 PT05/CSV	45
119:	HAWKESBURY WINE, FOOD & MUSIC AFFAIR GC030/029 PT1/CSV	47

ORDINARY MEETING**Table of Contents****Meeting Date:** 12 December 1995

Page 5

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
120:	HAWKESBURY LIFE EDUCATION GF008/001 PT12/CSV	49
121:	CONTRACTS FOR EXECUTION UNDER SEAL GC283/120 PT01 & GC120/004 PT02/CSV	50
122:	RICHARDSON PARK - SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION PROPOSAL P1358/600 PT01/CSV	51
123:	ANNUAL STATEMENTS OF ACCOUNTS GF001/001 PT3 & GF011/007 PT1/FNC	53
124:	GOVERNOR PHILLIP RESERVE, WINDSOR - UPPER HAWKESBURY POWER BOAT CLUB RACING CALENDAR PK/205 PT4/ENG	57
125:	1996 TRIATHLON AUSTRALIAN TOUR RACE - NEPEAN TRIATHLON COMMITTEE GR030/007 PT2/ENG	58
126:	GOVERNOR PHILLIP RESERVE - EXCLUSIVE USE - MOTOR CYCLE EXPO & FAMILY FUN DAY - PETER LEASK, LIFE & DEATH MOTORCYCLE CLUB NSW INC PK/205 PT4/ENG	59
127:	HAWKESBURY SPORTS STADIUM P1950/213 PT08, DA0233/94/ENG	62
128:	ROADS & TRAFFIC AUTHORITY 1995/96 PROGRAM FUNDING GG021/110 PT05, GG021/010 PT03, GT230/007 PT03/ENG	63
129:	DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN - AMENDMENT NO. 42 - CLAUSE 25 OF HAWKESBURY LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 1989 LEP13/95/EVD	66
130:	CLAREMONT COTTAGE, CLAREMONT LANE, WINDSOR - SITE DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS GH020/033 PT2/EVD	67
131:	WASTE MINIMISATION & MANAGEMENT BILL 1995 GW010/023 PT02/EVD	69

ORDINARY MEETING**Table of Contents****Meeting Date:** 12 December 1995**Page 6**

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
132:	AMPOL ROAD PANTRY, RICHMOND INN HOTEL-MOTEL AND PROPOSED RICHMOND MARKETPLACE SHOPPING CENTRE - CONSTRUCTION OF A RAISED MEDIAN STRIP IN EAST MARKET STREET BETWEEN MARCH AND LENNOX STREETS DA0056/95 PT03; DA0203/90 PT02/EVD	76
133:	BUILDING INSPECTION FEES GS080/003 PT02/EVD	79
134:	TOURIST/RECREATION RESORT AND COMMUNITY TITLE SUBDIVISION PROPOSAL - "THE RIDGE", WISEMANS FERRY ROAD, CATTAI GT090/003 PT07/EVD/EVD	84
135:	TENDERS - WASTE COLLECTION CAB AND CHASSIS GT020/300 PT01/EVD	87
136:	BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT & LAND EXCHANGE PROPOSAL - LOT 1016 DP241424 NO. 41 CASTLEREAGH ROAD, RICHMOND, & ADJOINING PUBLIC RESERVE BEING LOT 1070 DP241457 - MR R W ROSE LEP3/95/EVD	88
137:	REZONING APPLICATION - LOT 11 DP803218 CNR OAKVILLE & SMITH ROAD - APPLICANT: MR & MRS P JAMES LEP19/95/EVD	89
138:	DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN - LOT 5, PT LOTS 3 & 1 FP977347 NO. 63 BELLS LINE OF ROAD, NORTH RICHMOND LEP9/95/EVD	90
139:	FORTNIGHTLY GARBAGE COLLECTION AND RECYCLING SERVICE PROPOSAL FOR THE MACDONALD VALLEY AND COLO HEIGHTS GW010/017 PT05/EVD	91
140:	HAWKESBURY RIVER - RECREATIONAL WATER QUALITY GR060/011 PT05/EVD	93
141:	TENDERS - WASTE COLLECTION VEHICLE GT020/301 PT01/EVD	96
-	SECTION 5 - Reports for Information	
142:	BUSH FIRE ESTIMATES 1995/96 GC070/001 PT7/FNC	99

ORDINARY MEETING**Table of Contents****Meeting Date:** 12 December 1995

Page 7

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
143:	BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT GC305/072 PT01/ENG	100
144:	HAWKESBURY RECREATION PLAN GR030/045 PT02/ENG	101
145:	McQUADE PARK - BORE WATER/IRRIGATION PK/203 PT10/ENG	102
146:	WINDSOR/RICHMOND BYPASS PROPOSAL GR120/020 PT02/ENG	104
147:	DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN - EQUESTRIAN VILLAGE, RACECOURSE ROAD, CLARENDON - AMENDMENT NO. 40 LEP007/94 PT01/EVD	105
148:	BLIGH PARK NORTH RESIDENTIAL RELEASE AREA - SUBMISSIONS - HABITAT SURVEY LEP0011/95; LEP0016/93; DCP0005/95/EVD/EVD	107
-	SECTION 6 - Reports of Committees	
	Floodplain Management Committee - 1 May 1995	113
	Local Traffic Committee - 17 November 1995	115
	Hawkesbury Local Economic Development Board - 1 December 1995	120
-	Questions without notice	
-	Questions From The Gallery	

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

ORDINARY

Mayoral Minutes

ORDINARY MEETING
Mayoral Minutes

Mayoral Minutes

ORDINARY MEETING - 12 December 1995

No Mayoral Minutes Were Submitted

******* END OF MAYORAL MINUTES *******

ORDINARY

Section 2 **Notices of Motion**

ORDINARY MEETING
Notices of Motion

Notices of Motion

Ordinary Meeting - 12 December 1995

By Councillor R Sahasrabuddhe:

That Council support the proposal to develop an integrated four to five star health and tourist resort in the area. Further, that the proposal be referred to the North Western Sydney Regional Development Organisation as a project of regional significance and with a view to seeking their support in obtaining funding under the Regional Development Program for the concept.

Background Notes

This proposal involves the development in the region of a state of the art health and fitness resort involving an integrated approach to health care prevention, health education and tourism, utilising new and existing facilities in the region.

The major component of the project would be development of a 150 bed four to five star health resort based on the well established Swiss approach to health care hotels. Generally, the market will involve some internal clients within Sydney and Australia and a major focus on the extensive South East Asian market. Clients of the facility would include people undertaking preventative care or alternative medicine programs to relieve stress and other ailments which could lead to surgery and or assist with post operative rehabilitation. The integrated health and tourism approach with this concept is seen as catalyst to recovery.

The concept potentially involves the use of and links with existing health facilities in the region such as the new Hawkesbury Hospital, the SAN Hospital, The Hills Private Hospital and the Moran Group's private hospital proposed for Annangrove, with links to the University of Western Sydney - Hawkesbury, Faculty of Health, Humanities and Social Ecology and tourism operators and accommodation within the region.

Councillor M Lawson:

That a report be provided for the Council on the State regional and local issues (specifically the impact for Hawkesbury) as a result of the recent State Waste Management Legislation and proposals. That the report include proposals for the position to be taken by the Council with the advantages and disadvantages of these addressed.

***** END OF NOTICES OF MOTION *****

ORDINARY

Notices of Motion of Rescission

ORDINARY MEETING
Notices of Motion of Rescission

Notices of Motion of Rescission

Ordinary Meeting - 12 December 1995

We The Undersigned:

At Council's Meeting held on Tuesday, 15 November 1995:

Item 65 Heritage Item: Melrose Cottage

57 East Market Street, Richmond.

We wish to rescind the motion passed on this matter.

Councillor Lorna Allan

Councillor Ted Books

Councillor Christine Paine

******* END OF NOTICES OF MOTION OF RESCISSION *******

ORDINARY

Section 3

Report of the General Purpose Committee

Report of the Meeting of the General Purpose Committee held at the Council Chambers, Windsor, on 28 November 1995, commencing at 9.30am.

PRESENT: Councillor R P Stubbs, Mayor and Councillors L Allan, A W Baczynskyj, H J M Books, R G Calvert, M E Lawson, W J Mackay, P J Minturn, C A Paine, R Sahasrabuddhe, R D Searle and L C Sheather.

Councillor Paine arrived at 9.43am, Councillor Mackay arrived at 9.45am.

RESOLVED on the motion of Councillor Sheather and seconded by Councillor Allan that the Minutes of the General Purpose Committee Meeting held on the 31 October 1995, be confirmed.

The following recommendations were passed as resolutions of the Committee:

SECTION 1 - ENVIRONMENT

76: STOCKPILING OF MANURE AND SAWDUST FROM POULTRY FARMS - LOT 4 DP239897 NO. 137 COMMERCIAL ROAD, VINEYARD (DA154/89/EVD)

Applicant:	J Sultana
Applicants Reps:	Falson & Associates
Owner:	J & P Sultana
Stat. Provisions:	Hawkesbury LEP 1989
Area:	2.024ha
Zone:	Rural 1(c)
Advertising:	14 days to adjoining owners, 3 submissions received
Date Received:	12 April 1989 - additional information received 10 November 1994, 27 June 1995 and 27 October 1995

Key Issues:

- , Odours
- , Water Pollution
- , Rural Residential Area
- , Dust
- , Amenity

Action:

Refusal

Mr Haines, objector, addressed the Committee

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

A SITE INSPECTION be carried out.

The Committee inspected the site at 5.10pm. Councillors present at the inspection were Councillors Baczynskyj, Searle, Calvert, Paine, Allan, Lawson, Sahasrabuddhe and Books. Councillor Calvert was elected as Chairperson.

Mr Sultana, the applicant, addressed the Committee.

THAT THE APPLICATION be approved with appropriate conditions to be brought to the Ordinary meeting on 12 December 1995.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**Recommendation**

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

1. Stockpile area is not to exceed 11.0m (eleven point zero) x 16.0m (sixteen point zero) x 2.4m high (two point four) at any time.
2. Area external to the bunded area to be grassed except where vehicle access is required to the bunded area by delivery vehicles.
3. Operation to be conducted at all times such that no pollution occurs to the downstream waterways.
4. Odours to be controlled at all times so that the amenity of the neighbourhood is not adversely affected.
5. Dust generation and emissions to be controlled at all times so that there is no adverse impact on the environment of the site or surrounding area.
6. Submission of a detailed plan and calculations for the proposed bunded area and stormwater controls and disposal within 30 (thirty) days of the date of this development consent. Such plans and calculations shall be prepared by persons qualified in hydrology and soil chemistry and shall be to the satisfaction of the Director of Environment and Development.
7. The plan referred to in Condition 6 shall be implemented within 30 (thirty) days of approval being issued.
8. Provision of satisfactory vehicular access to the land to the requirements of the Divisional Manager Engineering Operations.

9. No advertising structures to be erected, displayed or affixed on any building or land without prior approval. Any unauthorised advertising structure will be removed at the expense of the advertiser.
10. Provision of adequate loading and unloading facilities to cater for the proposed use of the land.
11. The development shall be conducted in such a manner so as not to interfere with the amenity of the neighbourhood in respect of noise, vibration, smell, dust, waste water, waste products or otherwise.
12. Operating hours shall be limited to 7.30am to 4.30pm Monday to Friday. Any alteration of these hours will require the approval of the Director of Environment and Development.
13. Erosion and sedimentation control devices shall be installed and maintained during construction. Details shall be submitted and approved prior to any works commencing.
14. All waste materials, included any dead poultry, to be removed from the site daily.
15. No materials to be packaged on the site and no retail sale of materials to be undertaken from the site.

**77: HOME ACTIVITY - WHOLESALE VEHICLE DEALER'S LICENCE - LOT 11 DP248509
238 COMMERCIAL ROAD, OAKVILLE (DA237/95/EVD)**

Applicant: Mr Don McGlinchie
Applicants Reps: Not known
Owner: Mr D & Mrs B J McGlinchie
Stat. Provisions: Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 1989
Area: 2.027 hectares
Zone: Rural 1(c)
Advertising: 14 days to 6 adjoining owners, 2 submissions received
Date Received: 11 October 1995

Key Issues:

, Amenity

Action:

Approval, subject to conditions

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT THE APPLICATION be approved subject to the following conditions:-

1. No advertising structures to be erected, displayed or affixed on any building or land without prior approval. Any unauthorised advertising structure will be removed at the expense of the advertiser.
2. No signs shall be displayed on the footpaths, pedestrianways, roadways or in the vicinity.
3. Operating hours shall be limited to 8.00am to 6.00pm Mondays to Fridays. Any alteration of these hours will require the approval of the Director Environment and Development.
4. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plan submitted with the application.
5. No motor vehicles are to be displayed for sale on the subject premises.
6. No more than 3 (three) vehicles associated with the Home Activity shall be stored on the property at any one time.
7. All vehicles purchased shall be stored within the existing shed.
8. The driveway to the shed shall be constructed of an all weather surface.
9. Compliance with the following requirements of a "Home Activity" as defined in HLEP, 1989:
the activity or pursuit does not -
 - (i) interfere with the amenity of the locality by reason of the emission of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, vapour, steam, soot, ash, dust, waste water, waste products, grit, oil or otherwise;
 - (ii) involve exposure to view from any public place of any unsightly matter;
 - (iii) require the provision of any essential service main of a greater capacity than that generally available in the locality;
 - (iv) involve the employment of persons other than residents of the dwelling house or dwelling;
 - (v) involve the exhibition of any notice, advertisement or sign (other than a notice or sign not exceeding 1 (one) metre by 0.6 (zero point six) metres exhibited on that dwelling house or dwelling to indicate the name and occupation of the resident thereof)."

The trucks are not to be used for any transport of goods when stored on site.

78: FUNCTION HALL - USE OF EXISTING BUILDING - LOT 12 DP834771 NO. 99 GADDS LANE, NORTH RICHMOND (DA154/95/EVD)

Applicant: A Radanovic (Richmond Estate Winery)
Applicants Reps: Not Known
Owner: A & M Radanovic
Stat. Provisions: Hawkesbury LEP 1989
Area: 10.65ha
Zone: Rural 1(b)
Advertising: 14 days to adjoining owners, 3 submissions received
Date Received: 3 July 1995, additional information received 7 November 1995

Key Issues:

, Noise
, Access
, Traffic
, Parking

Action:

Approval

Ms Muriel Hillston and Mrs Movia, objectors, addressed the Committee

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

- A. THAT THIS APPLICATION be approved subject to the following conditions:-
1. All vehicular access to and from the site to be via the end of Gadds Lane and the right of way is not to be used for bus and visitors vehicles.
 2. Parking shall be provided on-site for 5 (five) vehicles and 1 (one) bus/coach in accordance with Council's Parking Policy with adequate space provided for vehicles and buses/coaches to turn around within the property to ensure all vehicles and bus/coaches enter and leave the site in a forward direction. Parking spaces, accessways and aisles to conform to Council's Development Control Plan No. 2 and to be constructed, drained, sealed and marked. Turning access to conform to the turning profiles recommended by the Roads and Traffic Authority. Full details of works and site layout to be submitted and approved before any works are commenced.

3. Submission of a building application, plans and specifications complying with the Building Code of Australia.
4. No advertising structures to be erected, displayed or affixed on any building or land without prior approval. Any unauthorised advertising structure will be removed at the expense of the advertiser.
5. All waste materials to be stored and disposed of at regular intervals to the satisfaction of the Director Environment and Development.
6. Provision of toilets in accordance with the requirements of the Building Code of Australia.
7. Any building or part thereof to be used for the purpose of storage, preparation or sale of food for human consumption shall be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Food Act 1989 and Regulations thereunder and Council's Food Premises Code.
8. No excavation or site works shall be commenced prior to the issue of the building permit.
9. The development shall be conducted in such a manner that noise levels measured at any boundary do not exceed 5dB(A) above background noise levels.
10. The submission of an erosion and sedimentation control plan for approval prior to any works commencing.
11. No signs shall be displayed on the footpaths, pedestrianways, roadways or in the vicinity.
12. The development shall be conducted in such a manner so as not to interfere with the amenity of the neighbourhood in respect of noise, vibration, smell, dust, waste water, waste products or otherwise.
13. Operating hours shall be limited to 12.00noon to 5.00pm 7 (seven) days per week. Any alteration of these hours will require the approval of the Director Environment and Development.
14. The development shall be carried out in accordance with 2 (two) plans dated 28 June 1995 and 29 June 1995 submitted with the application except where modified by the conditions of the consent.
15. Provision of planting along the common boundaries with Lot 11 DP834771 No. 111 Gadds Lane to screen the development, buildings and parking areas from Lot 11, full details to accompany the building application.
16. The function hall is not to be used as a reception venue for weddings, parties and the like.

B. The objectors be advised of Council's decision.

**79: TENNIS COMPLEX - PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION - LOT 1 DP843500 NO. 42
CANOONA AVENUE, WINDSOR DOWNS (DA238/95/EVD)**

Applicant: Tony Podesta
Applicants Reps: Don Fox Planning Pty Ltd
Owner: T Podesta & M O'Sullivan
Stat. Provisions: Hawkesbury LEP 1989
Area: 2.003ha
Zone: Rural 1(c)
Advertising: 14 days to adjoining owners
Date Received: 12 October 1995

Key Issues:

, Covenants
, Hours of Operation
, Traffic and Access
, Noise
, Parking
, Nature Reserve
, Drainage
, Amenity
, Lighting

Action:

Approval

Ms Sarah LLewellyn, for the applicant addressed the Committee.

Mrs S McGrath, objector, on behalf of the Windsor Downs Homeowners Association, Mr Dean Smith, Mr Allan Currell, Mr Ray Bray, objectors, addressed the Committee

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT THIS ITEM not be approved and appropriate reasons be reported to the Ordinary Meeting.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**Recommendation**

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

1. The noise emissions from activities on the site and from traffic arriving and leaving the site could adversely affect the amenity of the neighbourhood.
2. The traffic generated by the development could create a traffic hazard on the local road system which has not been designed for commercial traffic.
3. The proposed 10.30pm finishing time 7 (seven) days per week is contrary to the rural/residential nature of the area and the activities usually found in a rural/residential area.
4. The stormwater drainage and runoff from the increased sealed and covered areas could adversely affect the existing drainage patterns in the area and the adjacent Windsor Downs Nature Reserve.
5. The proposed development is contrary to the objectives of the Rural 1(c) zone under Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 1989.
6. The proposed development because of bulk, scale and lighting could adversely affect the landscape and scenic quality of the area.
7. Overall the proposed development could adversely affect the local environment and the amenity of the area and approval would not be in the public interest.

80: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN THE GREATER METROPOLITAN REGION - DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND PLANNING (GT150/003 PT3/EVD)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT THE INFORMATION be received.
2. That a residential development strategy be prepared for the City.

81: HOME ACTIVITY - TUTORING, TRANSLATING, CONSULTANCY & ORGANISING THE EXPORT OF AGRICULTURAL GOODS - LOT 8 SP21885 NO. 8/5 PAGET STREET, RICHMOND (DA208/95/EVD)

Applicant: A Senn & E Sutiojon
Applicants Reps: Not Known
Owner: Mr I J Cooper
Stat. Provisions: Hawkesbury LEP 1989
Area: 93.000sqm
Zone: Residential 2(c)
Advertising: 14 days to adjoining owners, 2 submissions and additional 7 days to occupants of adjoining units in block, no submissions
Date Received: 1 September 1995

Key Issues:

, Submissions Received
, Parking
, Noise
, Amenity

Action:

Refusal

Mr Ashley Senn, applicant, addressed the Committee

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT THIS APPLICATION be approved, to be reassessed by Council in 12 (twelve) months.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

At the General Purpose Committee meeting on 28 November 1995, it was requested that conditions for approval be reported to the Ordinary meeting. The following conditions are submitted:-

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with plans submitted with the development application.
2. No advertising structures to be erected, displayed or affixed on any building or land without prior approval. Any unauthorised advertising structure will be removed at the expense of the advertiser.

3. No signs shall be displayed on the footpaths, pedestrianways, roadways or in the vicinity.
4. Compliance with the following requirements of a "Home Activity" as defined in HLEP, 1989:
the activity or pursuit does not -
 - (i) *interfere with the amenity of the locality by reason of the emission of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, vapour, steam, soot, ash, dust, waste water, waste products, grit, oil or otherwise;*
 - (ii) *involve exposure to view from any public place of any unsightly matter;*
 - (iii) *require the provision of any essential service main of a greater capacity than that generally available in the locality;*
 - (iv) *involve the employment of persons other than residents of the dwelling house or dwelling;*
 - (v) *involve the exhibition of any notice, advertisement or sign (other than a notice or sign not exceeding 1 (one) metre by 0.6 (zero point six) metres exhibited on that dwelling house or dwelling to indicate the name and occupation of the resident thereof)."*
5. The development shall be conducted in such a manner so as not to interfere with the amenity of the neighbourhood in respect of noise, vibration, smell, dust, waste water, waste products or otherwise.
6. No more than 1 (one) student shall visit the premises for tutoring at a time.
7. The development consent shall be limited to a period of 12 (twelve) calendar months from the date of consent. At the expiration of this consent, the Director of Environment and Development will determine:-
 - (a) to allow a continuance of the use and for what period; or
 - (b) report the matter back to Council.

82: TRUCK DEPOT - PARKING OF THREE FURNITURE TRUCKS ON AN OVERNIGHT BASIS - PT POR 451 PARISH WILBERFORCE BURGESS ROAD, FREEMANS REACH (DA220/95/EVD)

Applicant: Hawkesbury Valley Removals Pty Ltd
Applicants Reps: Not Known
Owner: Mr P & Mrs L Tyszyk
Stat. Provisions: Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 1989
Area: 1.634ha
Zone: 7(d1) Environmental Protection (Scenic)
Advertising: Adjoining owners notified with 2 submissions received
Date Received: 15 September 1995

Key Issues:

, Dust Problems
, Traffic
, Amenity
, Submissions

Action:

Conditional Approval

Mrs Lisa Tyszyk, applicant, addressed the Committee
Mr Mario Tesoriero, objector, addressed the Committee

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT THIS APPLICATION not be approved as:

1. The proposal is not in the public interest.
2. The use is against the Rural 7(d1) Environmental Protection (Scenic) zoning.
3. It will create unnecessary traffic generation.
4. Any further conditions necessary will be reported to the Ordinary Meeting.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

At the General Purpose Committee meeting on 28 November 1995, it was requested that reasons for refusal be reported to the Ordinary Meeting. The following reasons are submitted:-

1. The proposal is not in the public interest.

2. The application is contrary to the zoning objectives.
3. Unacceptable generation of dust and noise which will affect surrounding properties.
4. The increase in traffic generation by the proposal.
5. Adverse impact on the general amenity of the area.
6. The proposal is inappropriate for the site.

83: TREE CLEARING PROPOSAL FOR A MARKET GARDEN - LOT 12 DP588380 NO. 133 TERRACE ROAD, NORTH RICHMOND (DA0155/95PT01; P2003/95PT01/EVD)

Applicant: Mr E Micallef
Applicants Reps: Mr W Wilson
Owner: Mr E & Mrs C Micallef
Stat. Provisions: Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 1989
Area: 13.88ha
Zone: Rural 1(b)
Advertising: A development application for landfill, excavation of a dam and removal of trees was notified to adjoining owners with 7 objections being received
Date Received: Development application lodged on 5 July 1995, an application under the Tree Preservation Order was lodged on 5 April 1995 with an amended tree clearing application (the subject application) being lodged on 13 October 1995

Key Issues:

- , Sediment Control
- , Amenity
- , Suitability of Land for Market Gardening

Action:

Refusal

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

A SITE INSPECTION be carried out.

The Committee inspected the site at 3.28pm. Councillors present at the inspection were Councillor Stubbs, Mayor and Councillors Baczynskyj, Searle, Calvert, Paine, Allan, Lawson, Sahasrabudde, Books and Minturn.

Messrs Wilson, Richards and Sherriff addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant.

Mrs Paynter, Mrs Corkhill and Mr Cirignano, objectors, addressed the Committee.

THAT THE APPLICATION for tree clearing not be approved but that the applicant be advised that a further application could be considered if and when the moratorium on tree clearing for intensive agriculture is lifted.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

At the General Purpose Committee on 28 November 1995 there was discussion about the moratorium on tree clearing for intensive agriculture and possibly amending it so as to distinguish between clear felling and selective culling.

The moratorium was imposed by Council at a meeting on 8 August 1995 and provides as follows:-

"Council impose a moratorium on the clearing of native vegetation for new intensive horticultural developments until such time as areas have been defined and set aside for agricultural/horticultural activities within the Hawkesbury boundaries."

There was some discussion at the General Purpose Committee about the application of the moratorium irrespective of the number of trees proposed to be felled. It was queried whether there could be a distinction between clear felling and selective culling.

The drafting of the moratorium suggests that the Council had two concerns, being the environmental impact of clearing vegetation (not only trees) and the environmental impact of intensive horticulture. Therefore any distinction between clear felling and selective culling does not address the use of land for intensive horticulture.

In any event it would be difficult to effectively distinguish applications by the degree of clearing. For example, selective culling of trees for a market garden with an area of 10 hectares may greatly exceed the number of trees involved in "clear felling" for a market garden with an area of 2 hectares.

Many of the applications involve land where the natural vegetation has already been considerably modified by previous clearing and underscrubbing so the reference to "clear felling" could be misleading as perhaps the majority of the vegetation has already been cleared.

In summary, it is not considered that proposals to distinguish applications for clearing by either numbers of trees, percentage of trees, trees per hectare etc will succeed as the circumstances of applications vary greatly. These variations include the extent of the existing tree cover, its age and health, its location (on a ridge or near a creek), the area to be cleared, surrounding development, whether there is any understorey, slope, public submissions, the agricultural capability of the land, whether it is part of a corridor, presence of endangered fauna, proposals to replace trees felled etc.

Should Council wish to modify or lift the moratorium, it is suggested that the preferred approach would be to:-

1. Notify adjoining and nearby property owners of any applications for tree clearing for agricultural purposes;
2. Endorse heads of consideration to be used in the assessment of all applications;
3. Where initial investigation suggests the vegetation to be cleared may be part of a corridor, be significant or contain rare or endangered species, the applicant be required to fund a habitat survey with consultants to be engaged by Council. The cost of this for a 10ha property should not be more than \$3,000.
4. Depending upon the number and veracity of any objections, the applications be determined under either delegated authority or by Council in accordance with the heads of consideration.

The suggested heads of consideration are as follows:-

- . The extent of the existing vegetation (both trees and understorey)
- . The area to be cleared
- . Whether the vegetation is remnant vegetation not previously cleared;
- . The biological diversity of the land;
- . Whether the land is likely to contain endangered plant species or be a habitat for rare and endangered fauna;
- . Whether the vegetation has connective importance as, or as part of, a corridor of native vegetation;
- . The age and health of the vegetation to be cleared;
- . The topography of the land containing the vegetation including potential for erosion and impact on view lines;
- . The proximity of the vegetation to water courses or wetlands;
- . The agricultural capability of the land;
- . The development on surrounding land and in the locality generally;
- . Any proposals to mitigate the proposed clearing by the replacement of trees;
- . The method of clearing;
- . The opinion of adjoining and nearby property owners and the public generally.

It will be noted that the heads of consideration do not consider the environmental impact of the end land use, other than to require an assessment of the agricultural capability of the land as part of a merits based assessment on the proposed clearing. This is because the control or regulation of an intensive agricultural use of the land is a separate matter, both legally and in terms of policy.

As a consequence of "Our City our Future" a draft local environmental plan is currently being prepared to regulate intensive agriculture. This will enable Council to adopt detailed development control plans (DCPs) for intensive agricultural uses. The Department of Agriculture recently released a final draft of Best Practice Guidelines for Vegetable Growing which whilst not being a planning document provides an excellent base from which to develop a DCP.

Recommendation

That Council adopt the following policy to replace the moratorium on tree clearing:-

1. Notify adjoining and nearby property owners of any applications for tree clearing for agricultural purposes;
2. Endorse the heads of consideration which are listed in the report as the basis of assessing applications for tree clearing for agricultural purposes;
3. Where initial investigation suggests the vegetation to be cleared may be part of a corridor, be significant or contain rare or endangered species, the applicant be required to fund a habitat survey with consultants to be engaged by Council. The cost of this for a 10ha (ten) property should not be more than \$3,000 (three thousand dollars).
4. Depending upon the number and veracity of any objections, the applications be determined under either delegated authority or by Council in accordance with the heads of consideration.

**84: CLEARING OF LAND FOR RABBIT AND FIRE CONTROL - LOT 12 DP846650
TIZZANA ROAD, EBENEZER (DA0115/95 PT01/GMA)**

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT THE PROPOSAL to undertake understorey clearing works be approved subject to:

1. The submission of a management plan prepared in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture that is to include:-
 - a. erosion and sediment control;
 - b. works being undertaken so as not to interfere with the amenity of the neighbourhood in respect of noise, vibration, smell, dust, waste water, waste products or otherwise;
 - c. indication of the areas to be cleared and method of clearing;
 - d. no trees or understorey being removed within six metres of the side boundaries;
 - e. retention of all significant shade trees
 - f. payment of a bond of \$1000 with an inspection fee of \$60 (sixty dollars)

85: TREE REMOVAL APPLICATION - LOT 1 DP743221 NO. 119 SHEPHERDS ROAD, GLOSSODIA - APPLICANT: MR & MRS P MIFSUD (P1904/100/EVD)**COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION**

THAT THE APPLICATION for tree removal be approved subject to:-

1. The retention of all trees and vegetation along the length of the small natural water course to a width of 15 (fifteen) metres of either side of its banks as a means of providing a natural barrier for the containment of sedimentation produced when the soil is disturbed.
2. The substitute planting of 28 (twenty eight) super advanced trees along the rear boundary of the property. These trees to be native to the area.
3. Payment of a bond of \$1,000 (one thousand dollars) to be refunded on satisfactory completion of conditions.
4. That a report come back to the Ordinary Meeting with the condition of the trees.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The site has been reinspected and it is quite obvious that the soil has been cultivated and within an area of close proximity to the base of seven trees. The depth of this cultivation is unable to be determined and the type of implement used is also undetermined. There is no visible signs of fresh damage to the trunks of the trees and the foliage shows no visible signs that would indicate the trees are under stress from recent work. Of the trees inspected there were only two that could be considered as significant with the remainder having old scars to the main trunk area, probably pre-dating the current owner.

Advice has been obtained from A R Walmsley and Co concerning the standard of proof required in a prosecution under the Tree Preservation Order and in particular the relationship between the Tree Preservation Order and agriculture not requiring development consent. Mr Walmsley advises as follows:-

"It is the view of the writer that any of the following acts would amount to sufficient to find that a tree had been injured or wilfully destroyed:-

1. *cultivating in close proximity to a tree on a repetitive basis;*
2. *fertilising to an excessive extent within close proximity of a tree where the fertiliser was likely to damage the tree (noting that normal good husbandry would dictate staying a reasonable distance from trees for fear of damaging equipment); and*
3. *repetitive impact on a tree with agricultural equipment.*

Of course, these observations bring us to the question of evidence and what is likely to be accepted by a court as being sufficient to find that an offence has been committed. We fully appreciate that this element of the matter is highly variable and will depend very much of the particular circumstances of a specific matter. We hope that you will also appreciate that it is not possible to be precise in this regard.

In the first instance, before and after evidence is almost mandatory. Someone should be able to establish that the tree was previously alive and healthy. This may involve a neighbour, or other interested party, who has been able to make relevant observations. If only one tree is involved, it is highly unlikely that Council staff will be able to give that evidence in a direct sense. The other alternative, which is likely to be even more acceptable if a number of trees are in question, is to have an experienced Council officer observe the fallen trees, to observe the method whereby they appear to have fallen, to see that they still carry fairly fresh vegetation and that the trunk was healthy. Clearly, previously dead trees will have none of these features."

In view of the report as supplied by Mr Walmsley and the evidence as available with respect to the state of the trees, it is considered that a successful prosecution may not succeed as it would be difficult to establish beyond reasonable doubt that the trees were destroyed or in fact effected by the actions of Mr and Mrs Mifsud.

In order to establish that the trees have been effected and as a direct result of Mr and Mrs Mifsud's actions, a complete assessment of the trees is required and by a recognised tree surgeon/horticulturalist. This assessment would have to show that the actions directly resulted in the damage/destruction of the trees.

Recommendation

That the information be received.

86: TREE REMOVAL AGRICULTURE - LOT 6 DP239897 NO. 153 COMMERCIAL ROAD, VINEYARD - APPLICANT: MR J SULTANA (P361/590/EVD)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

A SITE INSPECTION be carried out.

The Committee inspected the site at 5.25pm. Councillors present at the inspection were Councillors Baczynskyj, Searle, Calvert, Paine, Allan, Lawson, Sahasrabuddhe and Books.

Mr Sultana, the applicant, addressed the Committee.

THAT THE MATTER be deferred to the Ordinary Meeting on 12 December 1995.

87: OUR CITY OUR FUTURE - RECOMMENDATION NO. 1 RURAL LANDS STUDY (GT225/013 PT02/EVD)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT:-

1. The information be received.
2. Council nominate 3 (three) Councillors to form part of the Steering Committee for the Rural Lands Study.
3. Council hold a workshop so that Councillors have an input into the brief for the Rural Lands Study and this to be held early in December.

88: FLOODPLAIN PLANNING (GC180/006PT02/EVD)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT THE INFORMATION concerning floodplain planning be received and that a report be brought forward reviewing Council's floor height standard, medium density housing policy and policy on urban rezonings given the information provided in this report.
2. In the absence of comprehensive evacuation plans with dedicated access. That the NSW Government be advised that Hawkesbury City Council supports the raising of the existing Warragamba Dam wall by 23 (twenty three) metres as recommended by the Warragamba Dam Interdepartmental Committee (IDC) and the respected environmental consultants, ERM Mitchell McCotter.
3. The NSW Government be requested to place the EIS for the raising of the existing dam wall on public exhibition along with the now proposed side spillway to allow proper debate on the merits of the alternative schemes.
4. Council seek under the Freedom of Information Act, all documentation prepared by the Warragamba Dam Interdepartmental Committee, including minutes of all meetings (IDC) on the raising of the existing Warragamba Dam wall.

89: SOLAR EFFICIENCY (DCP3/95/EVD)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT THE INFORMATION be received.
2. That the Development Control Plan for Solar Efficient Housing be placed on exhibition in accordance with the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations 1994.

90: DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 15/94 - PT LOT 6 DP39166 & LOT 1 DP563924 CNR PITT TOWN & WOLSELEY ROADS, McGRATHS HILL - APPLICANT: GRAHAM PRICE PTY LTD (LEP15/94/EVD)

Mr Glenn Falson, for the applicant, addressed the Committee

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT:

1. A clause be inserted in the Local Environmental Plan requiring the undertaking of necessary works with respect to soil contamination.
2. A clause be inserted in the Local Environmental Plan requiring consideration of adjoining agricultural activities in the assessment of applications.
3. The Local Environmental Plan be referred to the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning for gazettal following preparation of the Deed of Agreement and legally binding endorsement by Graham Price Pty Ltd.
4. A clause be inserted in the Local Environmental Plan prohibiting any medium density housing, including dual occupancy.

91: GRAHAM PRICE PTY LTD - MUSHROOM COMPOSTING - 100 PITT TOWN ROAD, MCGRATHS HILL (CORNER WOLSELEY ROAD) (P1641/700 PT02/EVD)

Mr Glenn Falson, for the applicant, addressed the Committee

Mr Colin Wilson, Mr Kevin Symons, Mrs L MacMillan, objectors, addressed the Committee

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT:

1. Hawkesbury City Council asks its solicitors to request the appeal by Graham Price Pty Ltd listed for hearing on the 6th December, 1995 against Justice Bannons order re the reduction of odour from compost production be adjourned to a date to be fixed after the decision by the Council to the application to the rezoning to residential the land at 100 Pitt Town Road, McGraths Hill and presently zoned for the production of compost and mushrooms.
2. A security of \$40,000 (forty thousand dollars) to be paid within 9 (nine) months of the gazettal of the local environmental plan which would be forfeited in the event that there is not cessation of composting within 12 months of the gazettal of the local environmental plan.

92: REZONING PROPOSAL TO ALLOW 36 RURAL/RESIDENTIAL LOTS, VINCENTS ROAD, KURRAJONG - TEERMAN & NEWTON PTY LTD (P2203/380 PT02/EVD)

The General Manager read a letter from Mr Bernard King.

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THE APPLICATION FOR rezoning be deferred.

93: NOISE CONTROL REGULATION 1975 - COMPLAINTS CONCERNING BARKING DOGS - DON STREET, KURRAJONG. (P413/50 PT01; P413/20 PT01; GE020/004/EVD)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT THE COMPLAINANT be advised that at this stage it is not proposed to take any further legal action but that the dogs which are the subject of the notices will continue to be monitored.

94: TWO LOT SUBDIVISION TO SEVER EXISTING DWELLINGS UNDER STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY NO.1 - LOT 16 DP 192412 m 1 MADDENS ROAD, NORTH RICHMOND. (SA0134/95PT01/EVD)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

1. That the applicant be requested to increase the area of the proposed Lot 2 to one hectare with a suitable ratio of frontage to depth.
2. On the basis of the amendment of the application to increase the area of the proposed Lot 2 to one hectare, the objection under State Environmental Planning Policy be supported and the application be referred to the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning for concurrence.
3. Following receipt of concurrence, the subdivision application be approved subject to the following conditions:
 1. The submission of a Compliance Certificate under Section 73 of the Water Board (Corporatisation) Act 1994 prior to the release of the linen plan.
 2. Dedication of a 6m (six) by 6m (six) splay corner, free of cost to Council, at the corner of Maddens Road and Slopes Road.
 3. The submission of a plan showing all existing services on the lots including septic tank and effluent disposal area, sewer connections, water connections and stormwater disposal, where applicable, and the correction of any encroachments or defects to the requirements of the Divisional Manager Environment and Development.
 4. The submission of the plan of subdivision, together with 4 (four) exact copies thereof, suitable for lodgement with the Registrar General.
 5. Payment of a linen release fee of \$180 (one hundred and eighty). This amount is valid until 30 June 1996.
 6. The subdivision shall be in general accordance with the submitted plan.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

At the General Purpose Committee meeting it was requested that conditions of refusal be brought forward to the Ordinary meeting of Council.

Reasons for refusal are as follows:-

1. The subdivision does not comply with the minimum area standard for subdivision in the Rural 1(b) zone under Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 1989.

2. Insufficient area available for on-site effluent disposal on the proposed Lot 2.
3. Not in the public interest.

95: SUBDIVISION TO CREATE FIVE ALLOTMENTS WITH BUILDING ENTITLEMENTS PLUS A SIXTH COMMUNITY LOT - LOT 18 DP 30468, m 26 CLIFF ROAD, FREEMANS REACH. (SA0106/95/EVD)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

A SITE INSPECTION be carried out.

The Committee inspected the site at 4.30pm. Councillors present at the inspection were Councillor Stubbs, Mayor and Councillors Baczynskyj, Searle, Calvert, Paine, Allan, Lawson, Sahasrabuddhe, Books and Minturn.

THAT ADJOINING AND nearby property owners be notified prior to further consideration by Council.

96: TOURIST/RECREATION RESORT AND COMMUNITY TITLE SUBDIVISION PROPOSAL - "THE RIDGE", WISEMANS FERRY ROAD, CATTAI (GT090/003PT07/EVD)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT THE INFORMATION be received.

97: TREE CLEARING PROPOSAL FOR A MARKET GARDEN - LOT 12 DP588380 m 133 TERRACE ROAD, NORTH RICHMOND - MICALLEF (DA0155/95PT01;P2003/95PT01/EVD)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

See Item 83.

SECTION 2 - INFRASTRUCTURE

13: MACQUARIE STREET, WINDSOR - CLEARWAY RESTRICTION (1341/R PT03/ENG)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT THE ROADS and Traffic Authority be requested to install "No Standing: 3.00pm-7.00pm" parking restriction north bound on Macquarie Street, Windsor, between Suffolk and Bridge Streets.

SECTION 3 - ORGANISATION AND RESOURCES

18: MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS - OCTOBER 1995 (GF011/005 PT04/FNC)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT THE INFORMATION be received.

19: MASONIC LODGE PROPERTY - WEST MARKET STREET, RICHMOND (P2338/105 PT01/CSV)

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT THE INFORMATION be received and expressions of interest be invited in terms of the possible future use of the Masonic Lodge buildings located in West Market Street, Richmond, as outlined in this report.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE:

1. Councillor Searle -

a. From the Rural Action Group, a question about penalties imposed on people who deliberately destroy trees - how are they policed?

b. Could he have a clear definition between clear felling and selective culling

The Director Environment & Planning advised that Council would need to get advice and he will supply a written report to Councillor Searle.

2. Councillor Searle - Wilberforce Park area - could there be an upgrade of this area.

The Director Assets & Recreation will look into this matter.

3. Councillor Baczynskyj - could the first meeting in January be brought forward a week.

This to be decided at the Ordinary Meeting

4. Councillor Sahasrabuddhe - could dual flushes on toilets be made compulsory.

ORDINARY - 12 December 1995

General Purpose Committee - 28 November 1995

Organisation & Resources

The Director Assets & Recreation will bring a report to the Ordinary Meeting.

5. Councillor Sahasrabuddhe - re: the roots of a tree on the Western side of Richmond Park are preventing the mowing of the grass.

The Director Assets & Recreation will make an assessment and take appropriate action.

6. Councillor Books - What is the situation if someone bulldozes down a whole lot of trees.

The General Manager advised.

7. Councillor Allan - from the Rural Action Group re the availability of Business Papers -can organisations be supplied with them.

The General Manager advised.

8. Councillor Paine - Would like a report on the feasibility of recording the votes.

The General Manager advised that this was reported to the last meeting.

9. Councillor Paine asked about Council's policy on supplying the names of objectors.

The General Manager advised that he will advise Councillor Paine on this matter.

The meeting terminated at 6.45pm.

Submitted to and confirmed at the meeting of the General Purpose Committee held on 30 January 1996.

.....
Mayor

ORDINARY

Section 4 **Reports for Determination**

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 116

ITEM: 116 HAWKESBURY NEPEAN CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT TRUST - REVIEW

FILE NUMBER: GR060/067 PT01/GMA

REPORT:

The Minister for Land and Water Conservation has directed that a review be conducted of the operations and funding of the Hawkesbury Nepean Catchment Management Trust. The process for the preparation of the review report is as follows :

- ! A steering group has been set up to refine the terms of reference of the review and direct the consultant performing the work. The Local Government Association is representative on this steering group.
- ! The consultants are consulting with a wide variety of persons and organisations to assist in the preparation of their report.

The Local Government & Shires Associations have prepared a draft submission and a copy of this is included with the Business Paper. It includes what the Associations see as a number of positive and negative features of the present Trust structure. In terms of the positive features the nine points mentioned are agreed and specifically issues of :

- ! Has raised community awareness about the catchment and catchment management.
- ! Has developed policy guidelines, for example in the area of soil erosion and vegetation management, which have been very useful.
- ! Is identifying "gaps" in the operation of various Government agencies.
- ! Provides a forum and information of catchment management issues.
- ! Responds to issues produced by Government agencies and is establishing a research base for all established data. This would be particularly useful in the embarking on the cumulative impact assessment issue.

There are a number of problems and issues raised regarding the current operation of the Trust and these include :

- ! It does not cover the whole of the catchment area
- ! Committee structure is cumbersome
- ! Trust is over staffed and has over use of consultants

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 116

- ! The four Senior Executives and the Chief Executive Officer have voting rights on the Trust Board
- ! Does not acknowledge the expertise of Hawkesbury River County Council and catchment management issues
- ! Is too research orientated and does not initiate enough co-operation action at the grass roots
- ! Tends to develop policies and programs internally prior to consultation and is not effecting any real change to the quality of the river.

It would be in a proper review and, given the short life span of the Trust, appropriate for it to respond to these issues prior to any final comment and recommendations being made. That process will not be available and accordingly it will be necessary for the Council to place any position based on its current knowledge.

Given the short life span of the Trust, its time to proceed through a full consultative process within the catchment and then develop strategies and plans could be considered as limited. This then needs to be considered with the comments regarding staff levels and use of consultants. In any organisation, function needs to be determined prior to organisational form. It would therefore not be inappropriate for the Trust to be working through its consultative process to a strategic plan placing this into functions and then final organisational form, which, as in all organisations to-day, would be subject to annual review. In those circumstances it would not be unusual for the Trust to have a level of staff and use of consultants appropriate to putting all those matters in place.

There has been an amount of comment from within and without the Council about the apparent cumbersome nature of current committees to the extent that this probably needs a review. In terms of the voting rights, there should be a clear separation of administrative and policy matters in any organisation.

The draft paper raises the issue of funding for the Trust which stands at \$3.5 million per year. It indicates the possibility of a catchment based levy to raise part of this expenditure. Given that the major water resource from the catchment is transferred to Metropolitan Sydney for its water supply, it is seen that payment for the Trust operations should be on a far wider basis than just those people that live within the catchment boundary. A more appropriate basis would therefore be a levy applied on water usage from the redistribution of the catchment water resources to its end users.

The Trust currently only operates in that area of a catchment below Warragamba Dam. There has been argument put forward why this is appropriate as well as that why the whole of the catchment should be included. From a basic philosophical viewpoint of catchment management the Trust should operate over the whole of the catchment and this would certainly add to co-ordination of catchment operations and also allow funds from the Trust to be spent in a larger area of the catchment where it is currently restricted to expenditure within its current boundaries.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council advise that it supported the principle of the Trust establishment and operations. It has seen a number of positive contributions and its operations to date specifically in raising awareness of the various issues and need the co-ordination of programs and works by the many Government Agencies operating in the area. That there have been a number of comments received regarding the time consuming and the apparent cumbersome nature of the current committee structure that needs to be reviewed. Council would support and request Local Government representation on the Trust structure, however does not see that one of these should automatically be the Chairman nor should they dominate in number the Board.

That in terms of total catchment management the Trust area of operation should include the entire catchment of the valley.

ATTACHMENTS:

AT-1 Draft Submission

FN:ORC12NAX.G35

****** END OF ITEM 116 ******

ITEM: 117 WINDSOR RUGBY LEAGUE COMPLEX - PROCEEDS OF SALE

FILE NUMBER: GC283/032 PT2/CSV

REPORT:

As a result of the Council resolution to reclassify the site known as the Windsor Rugby League Complex on Rifle Range Road, South Windsor, to allow its sale to Windsor Leagues Club Limited, Hawkesbury Sports Council has requested that the proceeds of the sale be made available to them for the maintenance and improvement of active public recreation areas throughout the City.

It is noted that the terms of the sale provide for a contract price of \$200,000, with a mortgage to be secured over the property for a period ten years at an interest rate of 5% per annum. Proceeds from the sale of Council properties are normally placed in accordance with Policy into the property development reserve for the purchase of other income producing properties, including some open space and recreational areas. Subsequently, it is suggested that the proceeds of this sale be placed in accordance with that Policy.

In any event, the sale is not expected to be completed until about mid next year due to the timeframe involved in the reclassification of the land from community to operational.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the proceeds of the sale of Lot 1 in Deposited Plan 582018 to Windsor Leagues Club Limited be allocated to the property development reserve.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.C01

****** END OF ITEM 117 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 118

ITEM: 118 COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF CAR PARK LAND - BAKER STREET, WINDSOR

FILE NUMBER: P732/140 PT05/CSV

REPORT:

As previously reported, the Land and Environment Court in 1992, directed that the Council proceed to acquire privately owned land being an existing car park located off Baker Street, Windsor, adjoining the Macquarie Arms Hotel. The subject land is owned by the Company Nevitono Pty Limited.

The land is zoned 5(a) under the Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 1989, and is shown as Parking on that plan.

Having regard to the zoning, the owner, over a number of years, had requested that Council consider acquiring the land. These requests were not agreed to and as a consequence the owner took an action through the Land and Environment Court with the Court ruling that Council proceed to acquire the subject property.

Whilst this decision was handed down in May 1992, the owner was at that time not in a position to transfer the land to Council due to other legalities impacting on the Company. Furthermore, consent from the Heritage Council was required in respect of the sub-division that was necessary to excise the subject property to enable transfer to be effected. It was some considerable time before this consent was forthcoming.

Under the Just Terms Compensation Act which applies to the compulsory acquisition of land the parties involved are required to negotiate settlement. To this end negotiations have taken place over a considerable time frame, however, agreement has not been reached as to compensation to be paid. In this situation, as reported in other instances to Council, the Legislation provides that the valuation for compensation will ultimately be determined by the Valuer General. However, the applicants have requested that the Council now proceed to acquire the land and, accordingly, a procedural resolution to do same is required. In terms of compensation, once this has been determined by the Valuer General, it will be further reported to Council.

So that the property does not automatically become "community" land a further resolution is required to classify the land as "operational".

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That Council proceed under the provisions of the Just Terms Compensation Act and the direction given by the Land and Environment Court to acquire that property owned by Nevitono Investments Pty Limited, described as Lot 3 in the Plan of Subdivision of Lot 1, DP69108 and Lot 1, DP600502.

2. That the property be deemed as operational under the terms of the Local Government Act.
3. The Common Seal of Council be affixed to all necessary documents.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.C02

****** END OF ITEM 118 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 119

ITEM: 119 HAWKESBURY WINE, FOOD & MUSIC AFFAIR

FILE NUMBER: GC030/029 PT1/CSV

REPORT:

Council at its meeting on 14th November, 1995, considered a report concerning future support for the Hawkesbury Wine, Food & Music Affair and resolved that there be a further report to Council after the full provision of profit and loss statements from the 1995 event have been presented.

The final profit and loss statement is now to hand and indicates total expenditure in the amount of \$59,878 with total income being \$59,754. The resultant operating loss was \$124. It is noted that included in the income is all corporate sponsorship received totalling \$21,000; Council's contribution of \$20,000; a Cultural Grant received for one of the performers and stall hire and glass sales. In addition it is noted that substantial 'in kind' sponsorship was received from various companies and organisations estimated to be in the order of \$50,000. This included substantial advertising, printing and promotional material as well as the provision of security services and on-site administrative accommodation. This, of course, is not reflected in the financial statements.

The report to Council at its last Ordinary Meeting which recommended that Council confirm its financial support for the 1996 event in a similar amount, that is \$20,000 followed a Mayoral Minute submitted to the previous General Purpose Committee Meeting which acknowledged the enormous success of the event in terms of not only its popularity being the largest single cultural event held in the area but also the significant economic advantages which accrued to the area as a whole.

At that meeting the Council, when accepting the Mayoral Minute, resolved as follows:-

"That Council formally recognise the outstanding efforts of the Hawkesbury Food and Wine Affair Committee in the successful staging of this inaugural event and confirm its support for a similar event to be held in October 1996 in Heritage Park, North Richmond."

In terms of its cultural program, for many years Council has been committed to the annual staging of the Macquarie Towns Festival. This annual program was well established and recognised and, indeed, attracted a degree of regional significance. The Council's financial contribution towards the Macquarie Towns Festival for 1994 was \$28,000. However, there was some suggestion as to the need to refocus on the district's cultural activities and to consider other available options. Consequently, at its meeting on 13th June, 1995, the Council, inter-alia, resolved to recognise the Hawkesbury Wine, Food and Music Affair Committee as a Sub-committee of the Council's Cultural Committee and reallocate an amount of \$20,000 from the financial provisions for Cultural events to the Wine, Food and Music Affair for 1995.

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 119

In terms of future events the organising committee for the Wine, Food and Music Affair is confident of increased patronage, income and corporate sponsorship, however, the matter has been discussed with the Chairman, and whilst the Committee is very optimistic as to achieving a greater financial return next year which thereafter can be reapplied to following years events, the Committee has requested that Council consider its financial support for 1996 at the same level as the current years funding. The Committee are already working on next year's event with a revised program.

Having regard to all the circumstances, particularly the anticipated increased cultural significance of this event on a regional basis and the local economic injection into the community through general expenditure in the district, which has been estimated to be in the order of \$200,000 it is considered appropriate that the Council commit its financial support for next year in the amount of \$20,000. It is reiterated that an investigation is currently underway to other events of a cultural nature that can be held in the Windsor and Richmond areas and this will be reported separately to Council in the near future.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council confirm its financial support for the 1996 Wine, Food & Music Affair to be held in October at Heritage Park, North Richmond, in the sum of \$20,000 (twenty thousand dollars) and provision made in the budget accordingly.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.C03

**** END OF ITEM 119 ****

ITEM: 120 HAWKESBURY LIFE EDUCATION

FILE NUMBER: GF008/001 PT12/CSV

REPORT:

A request from Hawkesbury Life Education has been received for ongoing support of their program.

Life Education is a program aimed at primary school pupils and is designed to teach children about their bodies and the damage that drugs and alcohol can cause.

The program was established four years ago and is supported annually by a grant of \$20,000 from the Drug and Alcohol Directorate. The annual outgoings of the Hawkesbury Life Education Unit are approximately \$75,000.

The Life Education caravan visits forty three schools in the Hawkesbury and surrounding areas and it is estimated that 11,000 children are reached.

The group is requesting ongoing annual support of approximately \$1,000. This contribution would go towards advertising and in return Council's name would feature on the Life Education caravan and the Council Logo would appear on each booklet.

Whilst there is not sufficient monies in the general donations budget, there will be a residue in the Sister City program and funds can be transferred from that vote.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council support Hawkesbury Life Education for 1 (one) year for the sum of \$1,000 (one thousand dollars).

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.C06

****** END OF ITEM 120 ******

ITEM: 121 CONTRACTS FOR EXECUTION UNDER SEAL

FILE NUMBER: GC283/120 PT01 & GC120/004 PT02/CSV

REPORT:

Transfer of Retail Lease	The Lease Agreement for the premises at Shop 1A McGraths Hill Shopping Centre be transferred from Mr F and Mrs M Barba to Mrs Phillippa Fogg for the purpose of a hairdressing salon. The term of the new lease is to be 3 (three) years with an option period of 3 (three) years, at a commencement rental of \$365.90 (three hundred and sixty five dollars and ninety cents) per month which is to be reviewed annually in accordance with the CPI for Sydney.
Deed of Funding Agreement	Department of Community Services Agreement for funding of community based programs including Long Day Care Centres, Pre-Schools, Mobile Resource Units and Council's Youth Recreation Officer.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council Seal be affixed to the abovementioned documents.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.C15

****** END OF ITEM 121 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 122

ITEM: 122 RICHARDSON PARK - SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION PROPOSAL

FILE NUMBER: P1358/600 PT01/CSV

REPORT:

At the September Ordinary Meeting it was resolved that an investigation be undertaken as to the possibility of establishing a supported accommodation facility, for adults with disabilities who have moderate to high needs, on land owned by Council being public reserve on the corner of Moray and College Street, Richmond, (Richardson Park) or other sites.

A community group of parents of children/young adults with moderate to severe disabilities and service providers submitted an application to the Department of Community Services for funding for a project called 'Side by Side' to provide recreation and short term respite for disabled adults. The funding application covered the areas of building construction and operation/management, however, a donation of land would be required.

Approximately 22 property owners in the direct vicinity of Richardson Park were asked to comment on the implication of any change of use of this parcel of land which is currently zoned Public Reserve.

As a result of the invitation to comment, four responses were received objecting to change of use of Richardson Park. No responses were received from surrounding residents in support of the application. Reasons for objection included:

- continued use of the park by children and grandchildren of residents in the vicinity of the reserve and the need for open space recreation areas in Richmond;
- potential drainage problems association with the parcel of land;
- the high volume of university vehicular traffic in the vicinity and, subsequently, concern regarding the safety of disabled residents;
- the park is named after Oswald Richardson who was an Alderman on Windsor Council from 1953 to 1965.

Residents also commented on the gradual degrading of recreation facilities provided at Richardson Park over a number of years with play equipment not being replaced.

Rezoning of Richardson Park would be required to enable a supported accommodation facility to be constructed on the site. Plans for the upgrading and landscaping of Richardson Park have been completed as part of a University of Western Sydney, Hawkesbury, student initiative and such works were to be scheduled into the 1995/96 Parks Improvement Program.

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 122

The 'Side by Side' project involves the construction of a facility which would accommodate seven permanent and two flexible/crisis placements. Alternatives to the use of land currently known as Richardson Park include:

1. Purchase of house and land on the open market. Considering the special needs of the intended residents of this project, it would be necessary to make modifications and extensions to an existing residence which would make this option costly;
2. Purchase of vacant land with a view to providing a purpose built structure. The acquisition of such property would cost in the vicinity of \$80,000 in areas such as Richmond. The cost of construction of three x three bedroom villas identified in the Side by Side application to the Department of Community Services has been identified as \$450,000 (plus and additional \$32,000 for special fitting and furnishings).

At this time Council does not hold any operational land suitable for this project in consideration of the philosophy of the 'Side by Side' project, which is to integrate local disabled individuals into the local community and preferably accommodate the needs of these residents in an area close to services, facilities and day activity programs.

It is understood that, unfortunately, funding for the 'Side by Side' accommodation was not approved by the Department of Community Services. However, as a result of investigations into this matter by Council staff, initial approaches have been made to the Department of Housing regarding the need for accommodation for moderate to severely disabled residents in the Hawkesbury.

The provision of land or facilities alone would not enable the 'Side by Side' to commence as funding is required for staffing and coordination of the project.

RECOMMENDATION:

Richardson Park (Lot 1, DP 204638) be retained as Public Reserve and that a 'People for Parks' group in the area be investigated to assist in the upgrading and development of the reserve.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.C37

**** END OF ITEM 122 ****

ITEM: 123 ANNUAL STATEMENTS OF ACCOUNTS

FILE NUMBER: GF001/001 PT3 & GF011/007 PT1/FNC

REPORT:

Annual Statements of Accounts for the period ended 30 June 1995 have been completed, audited and advertised in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1993. The Audit Certificate from Price Waterhouse is provided as an attachment to this report.

A summary of results in Commercial Format:-

<u>Operating Statements</u>	(\$,000)
Operating Expenses	27,704
Operating Revenues	33,509
Capital Grants, Contributions and Donations	5,243
Profit on Sale of Assets	199
Operating Surplus	<u>\$11,247</u>
<u>Balance Sheet</u>	
Current Assets	37,085
Current Liabilities	12,219
Net Current Assets	24,866
Non Current Assets	148,976
Non Current Liabilities	8,506
Net Assets	<u>\$165,336</u>

The results from operations of Activities and Programs for the General Fund in line with budgetary allocations for the period ended 30 June 1995, are detailed below. Also provided is the accumulated financial position of Available Funds.

Financial Position

As at 1/7/94	\$1,369,168
Net Movements	\$15,244
As at 30/6/95	\$1,384,412

ORDINARY MEETINGMeeting Date: **12 December 1995**Item: **123**

The Available Funds remained at a level for the period ended 30 June 1995, that puts Council in a good financial position. There were increases and decreases in both income and expenditure and these were reported to Council with the review of the Management Plan at the Ordinary Meeting September 1995.

Financial indicators continue to show steady yet restricted growth for the upcoming Financial Year. As recently reported, the negative trends in untied financial assistance grants have given way to small but significant increases which will, with tight financial management of budgetary constraints, assist in improving the sound financial platform that exists within Hawkesbury City.

Detailed below are the movements both to and from Reserves during the period and the balance as at 30 June 1995:-

Reserve	Balance 01-Jul-94	Transfers to Reserves	Transfers from Reserves	Closing 30-Jun-95
Internally Restricted Assets				
Cordners Corner	\$92,335.70	\$355.92	\$20,603.31	\$72,088.31
Car Parking	\$336,391.03	\$22,134.33	\$14,022.33	\$344,503.03
Drainage	\$84,792.68	\$5,024.11	\$42,668.18	\$47,148.61
Trees	\$3,373.06	\$226.67	\$0.00	\$3,599.73
Kerb and Guttering	\$98,683.83	\$83,769.12	\$63,153.62	\$119,299.33
Roadworks	\$107,375.58	\$80,084.24	\$163,433.54	\$24,026.28
Property Development	\$2,721,885.89	\$2,245,410.33	\$2,293,257.36	\$2,674,038.86
Loan Reserve	\$1,103,609.61	\$2,350,376.12	\$843,984.43	\$2,610,001.30
Information Technology	\$274,997.70	\$70,000.00	\$201,403.61	\$143,594.09
Election	\$30,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	\$50,000.00
S94 Bush Fire	\$15,629.75	\$2,533.52	\$2,000.00	\$16,163.27
Extractive Industries	\$94,388.72	\$35,777.51	\$0.00	\$130,166.23
Sullage	\$74,818.52	\$1,160,448.91	\$1,056,536.50	\$178,730.93
Garbage	\$206,485.73	\$2,830,365.93	\$2,672,480.54	\$364,371.12
Bligh Park	\$4,220,667.22	\$1,208,118.23	\$1,954,156.70	\$3,474,628.75
Workers Compensation	\$42,937.27	\$132,564.49	\$132,564.49	\$42,937.27
Plant	\$506,596.31	\$1,101,856.74	\$774,545.00	\$833,908.05
Risk Management	\$232,284.49	\$20,000.00	\$79,940.28	\$172,344.21
ELE	\$876,377.84	\$137,673.43	\$335,904.49	\$678,146.78
Glossodia/Freemans Water	\$51,877.58	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$51,877.58
Nth Richmond Sewer	\$6,965.76	\$0.00	\$6,965.76	\$0.00

ORDINARY MEETING
Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: **123**

Richmond Sewer	\$125,887.37	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$125,887.37
Wilberforce Water	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Kurrajong Water	\$9,970.61	\$0.00	\$251.85	\$9,718.76
Vineyard Water	\$3,969.51	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,969.51
Industrial Sewerage	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Mulgrave Sewerage	(\$874,578.26)	\$127,500.00	\$104,074.81	(\$851,153.07)
New Treatment Works	\$3,581,137.30	\$2,174,500.45	\$1,122,785.12	\$4,632,852.63
Environmental Plan	\$525,164.83	\$155,712.48	\$0.00	\$680,877.31
TOTAL	\$14,554,025.63	\$13,964,432.53	\$11,884,731.92	\$16,633,726.24
Externally Restricted Assets				
S94 Community Facilities	\$338,139.38	\$363,807.01	\$7,500.00	\$694,446.39
S94 Park Improvements	\$96,760.92	\$92,043.57	\$7,500.00	\$181,304.49
S94 Recreation Buildings	\$92,824.76	\$100,916.70	\$7,500.00	\$186,241.46
S94 Roadworks	\$159,158.90	\$99,084.64	\$0.00	\$258,243.54
S94 Parking	\$38,062.62	\$72,015.73	\$0.00	\$110,078.35
S94 Drainage	\$9,104.46	\$24,193.40	\$0.00	\$33,297.86
Parks and Gardens	\$306,764.39	\$65,279.78	\$102,183.42	\$269,860.75
Heritage	\$49,831.88	\$2,783.10	\$17,768.31	\$34,846.67
Sinking Funds	\$1,500,000.00	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,700,000.00
Self Insurance	\$820,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$820,000.00
TOTAL	\$3,410,647.31	\$1,020,123.93	\$142,451.73	\$4,288,319.51
GRAND TOTAL	\$17,964,672.94	\$14,984,556.46	\$12,027,183.65	\$20,922,045.75

Included in the transfers to reserves were unclaimed monies held prior to 1 January 1987, that remained in Trust. With the introduction of the new Local Government Act, acting on legal advice, unclaimed monies amounting to \$8,789.05 were drawn from Trust and paid to the Office of State Revenue during 1995 that exceeded statutory limitations.

Council has in its Accounting records several debts which have been outstanding for a considerable period of time. Every endeavour has been made to recover these debts and it is now necessary, and supported by the auditor, to have the amounts written off as irrecoverable.

The total amount which is outstanding and determined as being uneconomical, irrecoverable at law, or unable to be recovered is \$28,762.21. In addition an amount of \$39,336.62 was abandoned in the Rates Ledger due to; cancellation of levies, changes in rateability status and amounts raised in error.

ORDINARY MEETINGMeeting Date: **12 December 1995**Item: **123**

Detailed below is a summary of gross outstanding Rates and Charges as at 30 June 1995:-

Arrears 30/6/95

Rates	\$340,441
Interest	\$105,113
Garbage	\$98,577
Sanitary	<u>\$62,596</u>
	\$606,727

The collection performance achieved of 96.27% was largely due to changes in recovery procedures as a result of quarterly billing under the new Local Government Act. This impacted on the number of Summonses issued increasing from 305 in 1993 to 856 in 1994/95

RECOMMENDATION:

That the:-

1. Report on the Annual Statements of Accounts for the period ended 30 June 1995, and movements in Reserve balances be received.
2. Amount of \$68,098.83 (sixty eight thousand and ninety eight dollars and eighty three cents) be abandoned in accordance with the Local Government Act 1993.

ATTACHMENTS:

AT-1 Audit Certificate from Price Waterhouse.

FN:ORC12NBX.F16

******* END OF ITEM 123 *******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 124

ITEM: 124 GOVERNOR PHILLIP RESERVE, WINDSOR - UPPER
HAWKESBURY POWER BOAT CLUB RACING CALENDAR

FILE NUMBER: PK/205 PT4/ENG

REPORT:

The Upper Hawkesbury Power Boat Club has advised the 1996 racing calendar at Governor Phillip Reserve:-

13 January 1996
11 February 1996
10 March 1996
21 April 1996
5 May 1996 (Bridge to Bridge - Exclusive Use)
19 May 1996 (Exclusive use if 5 May cancelled due to bad weather)
16 June 1996
7 July 1996
4 August 1996
7 & 8 September 1996 (Two Day Spectacular)
13 October 1996
3 November 1996
24 November 1996
8 December 1996

The calendar complies with Council Policy regarding use of the Reserve. Local residents will be advised of the calendar.

To accommodate the calendar, the Drag Boat Racers Association have moved their exclusive use day from 26 May 1996 to 2 June 1996, and that latter date complies with Council Policy

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That approval be granted to the Upper Hawkesbury Power Boat Club 1996 Calendar at Governor Phillip Reserve, with exclusive use being granted for either 5th or 19th May 1996, subject to the Club paying the applicable contribution rate for exclusive use.
2. That approval be granted for exclusive use of Governor Phillip Reserve by the Drag Boat Racers Association on 2 June 1996, in lieu of 26 May 1996.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.E04

**** END OF ITEM 124 ****

ORDINARY MEETINGMeeting Date: **12 December 1995**Item: **125**

ITEM: 125 1996 TRIATHLON AUSTRALIAN TOUR RACE - NEPEAN TRIATHLON COMMITTEE

FILE NUMBER: GR030/007 PT2/ENG

REPORT:

Requesting permission to use The Driftway and Londonderry Road as an alternate route to Penrith for traffic travelling Hawkesbury Road and Castlereagh Road, due to the proposed closure of Castlereagh Road, South of Hawkesbury Road (Penrith City Council) for the 1996 Triathlon Australian Tour Race between 6.45am and 9.00am on Sunday 31 March 1996.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the use of The Driftway and Londonderry Road between 6.45am and 9.00am on Sunday 31 March 1996, due to the proposed closure of Castlereagh Road to traffic travelling Hawkesbury Road and Castlereagh Road to Penrith is supported, subject to the following conditions:-

1. The applicants submitted a copy of a Public Liability Policy for \$10,000,000 (ten million dollars) prior to the event.
2. The applicants obtaining approval from the NSW Police Service to conduct the event and complying with all the conditions imposed by the Service in granting any approval.
3. The applicants obtaining approval from the Roads and Traffic Authority for the use of Castlereagh Road between Hawkesbury Road and The Driftway as this is a classified main road.
4. All directional signs are to be removed immediately upon completion of that function.
5. The organisers to undertake advertising of the proposed closure during the month prior to the closure, as well as erect appropriate advertising signs on Castlereagh Road and Hawkesbury Road, 1 (one) month before the event.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.E17

****** END OF ITEM 125 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 126

ITEM: 126 GOVERNOR PHILLIP RESERVE - EXCLUSIVE USE - MOTOR
CYCLE EXPO & FAMILY FUN DAY - PETER LEASK, LIFE & DEATH
MOTORCYCLE CLUB NSW INC

FILE NUMBER: PK/205 PT4/ENG

REPORT:

Requesting exclusive use of Governor Phillip Reserve, Windsor, on Saturday 23 March 1996, to conduct a motorcycle expo and family day.

Purpose of Use

Family entertainment day encompassing multiple activities as detailed below. The applicants have specifically stated that 50% of profit will be donated to charity, with balance to be retained by the Life and Death Motorcycle Club NSW Inc.

Program of Events

- a) Show and Shine - a static display of motorcycles, drag boats and hot rods.
- b) Fireworks display.
- c) Drag boat demonstration.
- d) Ski jump demonstration.
- e) Martial arts and boxing display.
- f) Parachuting display.
- g) Best tattoo competition.
- h) Antique weapon display.

Entertainment

- a) Helicopter joy flights.
- b) Amusement rides - dodgems, jumping castle, ball run, merry go-round, mechanical bull.
- c) Side shows - fairy floss, duckshoot, clown mouths, tin knockdowns.
- d) Hot food/beverage outlets.
- e) Trade stalls - the goods on sale will be directed to the motorcycle industry, eg. leathersgoods.

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 126

- f) Bands - a big name band (eg. Screaming Jets) along with approximately three other bands (eg. Rock/Blues and Country Rock).
- g) A comedian master of ceremonies.
- h) Clowns.
- i) Arm wrestling, big boxing, sumo wrestling and a bungee run.
- j) Raffle.
- k) Tattooist.

Parking

Overflow parking East of Access Road will be required.

Amenities, Toilet Facilities, etc

Porta loos will be provided by the organisers in addition to public toilets and UHPB Clubhouse toilets.

Rubbish Management

Scattered bins will be provided and removed by the organisers, as well as large industrial bins for rubbish disposal.

Council Policy

Public Reserve usage:-

1. precludes granting permission to use public reserves for capital gain/commercial profit; and
2. the function is not a broad based community function and appears to be profit oriented, as evidenced by charging admission fee to the Reserve as well as several trade stalls undertaking retail sales.

General

1. The Club has stated 50% of profit will be retained by the Club to fund future charitable events.
2. The event intends to attract family units and it is considered that some proposed activities may cause offence, eg. best tattoo competition, as well as resident tattooist.
3. Live bands - adverse noise impact upon residents adjoining the reserve.

4. It is considered that Governor Phillip Reserve is an inappropriate venue given the nature of the event and impact upon adjoining residents.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be the Life and Death Motorcycle Club NSW Inc., for exclusive use of Governor Phillip Reserve on Saturday 23 March 1996, to conduct a Motor Cycle Expo and Family Fun Day, be refused as the venue is considered inappropriate.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.E25

****** END OF ITEM 126 ******

ITEM: 127 HAWKESBURY SPORTS STADIUM

FILE NUMBER: P1950/213 PT08, DA0233/94/ENG

REPORT:

Council, at its meeting of 14th November, 1995, resolved that "*Council construct the new entrance to the Sports Centre with all available resources and staff and the matter to be expedited*". The necessary survey work has been undertaken and plans for the construction of the entrance are nearing completion. The estimated cost of the work between the existing car park and the intersection of Ham, Drummond and Stewart Streets is \$80,000.

As can be seen from the plan displayed, the entrance to the Stadium will also incorporate access to the Netball Courts in Mileham Street Park. The intersection, which is currently subjected to relatively large volumes of traffic, would be further congested by access to the sporting venues and it is considered essential that a mountable type roundabout be provided at this location to provide equitable access to the road network and also the sporting venues. The roundabout would also provide a form of traffic calming to vehicles using Drummond/Stewart Streets, where vehicular speed has been the subject of a number of complaints, particularly from the Stimulus Centre and Greenhills Child Care Centre. The estimated cost of the roundabout and associated infrastructure (splitter islands etc) is \$50,000.

With regard to funding this work, it is proposed to utilise savings from previous construction and maintenance programs. Programs that have been finalised are a loan program from 1991/92, and financial assistance grants from 1992/93, 1993/94 and 1994/95.

When considering the previous report regarding the entrance to the Centre, there was some concern from Council in relation to the operating hours of the Centre. The current hours of operation are Monday to Friday 9am - 11pm, Saturday 9am - 7pm and Sunday 9am - 11pm. The Management Committee will be meeting on Thursday, 7th December, 1995, and the operating hours are on the agenda for that meeting for discussion.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the relocation of the driveway to the Hawkesbury Sports Stadium, including the provision of a roundabout at the intersection of Ham, Drummond and Stewart Streets be funded from savings from Loan 94 (1991/92) and financial assistance grants for 1992/93, 1993/94 and 1994/95.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.E31

**** END OF ITEM 127 ****

ORDINARY MEETINGMeeting Date: **12 December 1995**Item: **128****ITEM: 128** **ROADS & TRAFFIC AUTHORITY 1995/96 PROGRAM FUNDING****FILE NUMBER:** GG021/110 PT05, GG021/010 PT03, GT230/007 PT03/ENG**REPORT:**

The Roads & Traffic Authority has advised the following details of the 1995/96 funding for Council for the 1995/96 Financial Year.

3x3 Council Determined Program **\$516,000**
(4 year allocation)

Asset Management Program

Regional Roads Block Grant \$404,000

Ferry Maintenance & Operation

Wisemans Ferry (large)	\$249,000
Wisemans Ferry (small)	\$ 37,000
Webbs Creek Ferry	\$206,000
Sackville Ferry	\$168,000
Spare Ferry	\$ 5,000

Network Amenity Program

Local Bikeplan - Study Up Planning/Invest/Concept Devlp \$ 10,000

Network Amenity Program

School Zone Installations	\$ 16,000
Wombat Crossings	\$ 12,000
Windsor Street nr Bosworth Street, Richmond, pedestrian platforms (2)	\$ 18,000

Regional Road Rehabilitation Program

Freemans Reach Road - selected lengths \$ 105,000

3x3 Council Determined Program

This funding is Council's total allocation for the 4 year period from the Fuel Levy and is to be expended on road improvement, road safety or road related public transport infrastructure projects in accordance with the legislation. The proposed program for Council's consideration is:-

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 128

1. Freemans Reach Road - Selected lengths \$105,000

This funding would match the funding provided from the Regional Road Rehabilitation Program on the required 50/50 basis and would allow approximately 1.3km of Freemans Reach Road to be rehabilitated.

2. Stannix Park Road - Bridge Replacement \$ 60,000

It is proposed to replace the low level timber bridge on Currency Creek with concrete pipe or box culverts at a higher level.

3. Union Lane \$160,000

Reconstruct Union Lane from Kable Street to Fitzgerald Street and extend the Lane from Fitzgerald Street to Johnston Street enabling access to Hollands Paddock Car Park. This project was given a high priority when Council considered the Windsor Traffic Study.

4. Old Stock Route Road \$116,000

Rehabilitate Old Stock Route Road between Saunders Road and Scheyville Road.

5. Sackville Road, Wilberforce \$ 75,000

Rehabilitate Sackville Road between Woodlands Road and Ironbark Drive, including the closure of Woodlands Road at the Sackville Road intersection, the extension of a pipeline adjacent to Burdekin Road and provide a bus layby at this location.

Asset Management Program

The \$404,000 provided is the Roads & Traffic Authority's contribution towards maintenance of regional roads for the period.

Ferry Maintenance & Operation

This funding covers the total maintenance and operation of the RTA's ferries, including the contract operation.

Network Amenity Program

It is proposed to update the Bikeplan prepared in 1986 in line with current development of the area and the provision of the extensive bike facilities over the last twelve months.

Network Amenity Program

Council has previously prioritised School Zones installations and also resolved that a wombat crossing be provided in Bourke Street, adjacent to St. Monica's Primary School. Funding has also been provided in Council's current Construction Program for the installation of two pedestrian platforms in Windsor Street, Richmond, one at the existing pedestrian crossing

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 128

location adjacent to Richmond Park and the other at a new pedestrian crossing to be provided between West Market Street and Bosworth Street in proximity to the Coles entrance. It is proposed that the School Zone installation be nominated as the Ebenezer Public School and include orange flashing warning lights, the wombat crossing be nominated at Bourke Street between Windsor Street and Francis Street, and in lieu of the already funded pedestrian platforms in Windsor Street, it is proposed that the Roads & Traffic Authority be requested to approve the installation of three additional School Zone installations, these being at Windsor High School (Mulgrave Road), Richmond High School (Lennox Street) and East Kurrajong Public School (East Kurrajong Road).

Regional Road Rehabilitation Program

This funding has been provided as detailed previously on a 50/50 basis to rehabilitate selected lengths of Freemans Reach Road.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Program outlined in the report for the 1995/96 Funding be adopted and the grants be accepted in accordance with "Arrangement with Councils for Road Management".

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.E33

**** END OF ITEM 128 ****

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: **12 December 1995**

Item: **129**

ITEM: 129 DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN - AMENDMENT NO. 42 -
CLAUSE 25 OF HAWKESBURY LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN
1989

FILE NUMBER: LEP13/95/EVD

REPORT:

Council, at its Ordinary meeting of 14 March 1995, resolved to prepare a draft local environmental plan to include the word "habitable" in Clause 25(2) so that non habitable buildings can be erected on flood liable land. The clause is intended to now read as follows:-

(2) Except as provided by subclause (5), a habitable building shall not be erected on any land lying, as at the appointed day, at a level lower than 3 metres below the floor height standard for the area in which the building is to be located.

The proposal was referred to the State Emergency Service on 19 October 1995, but to date no reply has been received.

The Director of Urban Affairs and Planning issued the Section 65 Certificate and the draft plan was exhibited from 25 October 1995, to 24 November 1995. No submissions have been received and no action is required under Section 68 of the Act.

The proposal can now be forwarded to the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning for final gazettal.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the local environmental plan be referred to the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning for final gazettal.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.V05

****** END OF ITEM 129 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 130

ITEM: 130 CLAREMONT COTTAGE, CLAREMONT LANE, WINDSOR - SITE DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS

FILE NUMBER: GH020/033 PT2/EVD

REPORT:

Correspondence has recently been received from the Heritage Council of NSW in relation to site development options for Claremont Cottage. Claremont Cottage, a significant heritage item, suffered extensive fire damage approximately two and a half years ago. The correspondence advises:-

"Development options prepared by a consultant engaged by the Heritage Council were considered by Council on 20 August 1994, and rejected on the grounds that they were contrary to the required curtilage for Claremont Cottage and conservation of the stables.

In October 1994, Council's Heritage Adviser, Mr Robert Staas, prepared an alternative development option that resited development further away from the cottage and the site of the stables. In view of the concern held by some members of the Heritage Council that further historical research should be carried out before any development option should be put before the Heritage Council for its endorsement formal consideration of the Staas option was deferred.

The second and final stage of that research was received in draft form in September 1995. The research adds to our understanding of the developments of the site, but does not contain any information that would rule out an appropriate development. Consequently, the conclusion of the historical research report, together with the Staas proposal referred to earlier, was submitted to the Heritage Council for its consideration and at its meeting of 2 November 1995, it resolved to endorse, in principle, the proposed development option and recommended for the favourable consideration of Hawkesbury City Council."

Prior to the fire, "Claremont Cottage" was recognised as one of the oldest and most significant houses in the Hawkesbury. Given its significance, Claremont Cottage was formerly identified as a heritage item in Schedule 1 of Council's Planning Instrument. The heritage significance of Claremont Cottage was also recognised by authorities such as the National Trust of Australia (NSW) and Australian Heritage Commission.

The significance of Claremont Cottage is such that ideally no further development should take place on the site other than the restoration of the fire damaged building. The costs of restoration, however, are considerable and it is unlikely that this preferred option will occur. Given that it is most likely that development will be required to offset the restoration costs of Claremont Cottage, development should only occur on the site in accordance with the plan approved by the Heritage Council of NSW. The plan was formulated by Council's Heritage Adviser, Mr R Staas, following consultation with the property owners, Mr and Mrs Mansfield, the National Trust of Australia, the Heritage Council, Councillors and staff.

Should an application be received which accords with the Staas plan, it is considered that such an application should only be approved conditional on the following:-

1. Full restoration of Claremont Cottage in accordance with the documentation prepared by the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning prior to commencement of any new development works.
2. Lodgement of a bond of \$500,000 with a Deed of Agreement to complete the restoration works in lieu of the full restoration of Claremont Cottage.
3. Supervision of restoration by a recognised conservation architect.

Imposition of the above conditions will ensure that Claremont Cottage is either fully restored prior to commencement of any new development on the site or there are sufficient monies available with a Deed of Agreement to ensure the work is completed in the future.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council support the Staas plan for redevelopment of the Claremont Cottage site as a means of funding restoration and that the owners be advised accordingly.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NCX.V09

****** END OF ITEM 130 ******

ITEM: 131 WASTE MINIMISATION & MANAGEMENT BILL 1995

FILE NUMBER: GW010/023 PT02/EVD

REPORT:

On 15 November 1995, the State Government released a discussion document which outlines the waste policy which is proposed for NSW. The Bill to enable this policy to be put in place (the Waste Minimisation and Management Bill 1995) is currently before Parliament. The government intends to have the Bill finalised to become an Act before the last day of Parliament for 1995 (15 December).

The underlying principles of this Bill are:-

- (a) to achieve by the end of 2000 a 60% reduction in the amount of waste disposed of in New South Wales (being a per capita reduction based on 1990 disposal rates), and
- (b) to establish a waste management hierarchy of the following order:-
 - ! avoidance;
 - ! re-use;
 - ! recycling and reprocessing; and
 - ! disposal.

State Waste Advisory Council

A State Waste Advisory Council (SWAC) will be formed. This nine member council will include representatives from:-

Local Government	(two)
Environment movement	(two)
Consumer groups	(one)
Waste industry	(two)
Industry	(one)
Environment Protection Authority	(one)

The primary function of this group is to advise the Minister and the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) on priorities relating to waste management.

The SWAC would appear to have an advisory role only. The LGSA supports the principle of a SWAC as it provides a forum for input of relevant parties but the Association advises that it may be more appropriate for the SWAC to determine Waste Board Regions, have a concurrence role in the approval of Regional Waste Plans and the allocation of funding from the Waste Planning and Management Fund.

Waste Management Regions

Waste Management Regions (WMRs) will be jointly determined by the Ministers for Local Government and Environment (s.10.2). A waste management region consists of two or more Local Government areas (s.10.1). For each WMR, a Waste Planning and Management Board (Waste Board) will be constituted. This will initially be mandatory in the Sydney, Illawarra and Hunter regions only but there is provision for exemptions. There will be a maximum of four WMRs in the Sydney metropolitan area and one each in the Illawarra and Hunter regions (the latter to include Gosford and Wyong).

Councils can apply for an exemption from joining a WMR but they must provide details to the Minister. An exemption may be granted if the following criteria are met:-

- ! the council has in place a comprehensive scheme for reducing waste within its area consistent with the 60% waste reduction target;
- ! the waste reduction solutions are self-supporting, and there is no assumption of Government subsidies;
- ! the council has in place a scheme which provides for disposal of the waste generated in the area, and which involves a long-term disposal contract;
- ! waste recycling programs are underpinned by long-term supply contracts; and
- ! waste collection systems are operating efficiently.

The government will produce guidelines for the formation of WMRs prior to their formation. For each WMR, the Minister will appoint a general manager (s.16). A Waste Board will consist of eight members nominated to the Minister by constituent councils (s.14.2/3), as well as the general manager.

Waste Boards

When nominating Board members, constituent councils must include one or two people who are not council employees or elected members (s.14.5).

The role of Waste Boards will be to perform waste planning, development and operational functions within their region (as specified in s.18). They will be required to produce a Regional Waste Plan.

Significantly, Waste Boards will have power to provide garbage collection and recycling collection services for member councils, specify bin sizes and frequency of collection and make application to the Minister for Urban Affairs and Planning for new putrescible landfills. There is now only very limited life in the existing putrescible landfills in Sydney and it is certain that one or more new large landfills will be required in the short-medium term no matter how successful the Government's waste reforms are.

The Waste Boards will have power to require funds from member councils to support approved Waste Board initiatives.

The City of Hawkesbury should be concerned that it may be a possible site for a new putrescible land fill given that if it is part of a Waste Board, the majority of constituent councils are likely to be more urban, if not completely urban. It is also possible that other Waste Boards may seek approval for putrescible landfills outside their area.

Also of concern is the fact that with four Waste Boards in the Sydney Region there will be, on average, ten constituent councils in each Board with only a maximum of eight members. It is possible that some of these members will not be elected members or council employees. Therefore, it is likely that not all councils, as corporate entities, will be represented on a Board.

It is an offence under the Environmental Offences and Penalties (EOP) Act if a Waste Board does not produce a Waste Plan (s.23) or if a constituent council fails to comply with a Regional Waste Plan. Waste Boards will report at least annually on their achievements.

The LGSA feels that regions should be determined through a consultative process as it does not seem appropriate for the Ministers to determine them.

Councils could consider the possibility of adapting the existing Regional Organisation of Councils (ROCs) framework (remembering that there will only be a maximum of four RWBs in the Sydney region). Alternatively, there could be a single RWB for the entire Sydney region with the Board being comprised of representatives from the ROCs.

Councils will need to consider the implications of joining a region on their existing contracts. Some existing collection/recycling contracts may run for up to five years and councils may be prevented from adopting policy decisions made by their RWB during this time.

Councils can apply for an exemption (s.11) from joining FWB but will not be able to access funds from the Waste Planning and Management Fund (s.73). There appears to be support for a single RWB for the Sydney area, ie. forty one councils. The members of the Local Government Recycling Co-operative could also be Board members.

Industry Waste Reduction Plans

Industry Waste Reduction Plans (IWRPs) will initially target the packaging, used tyres, building materials and demolition industries. The EPA will prepare a scoping paper for the targeted industry (s.35.1) and must include any advice given by the SWAC. The EPA decides which parties should be involved in negotiation of the IWRP (s.35.3). Generally, IWRPs will be negotiated between industry and the EPA.

This system could be quite effective but as it stands it is fairly open ended. There is no guarantee that there will be any public consultation regarding the development of an IWRP. This is at the discretion of the EPA. The SWAC would appear to be a more appropriate body to negotiate with industry. There is also no assurance that an IWRP will include targets, milestones or deadlines, or that industry will be required to fund programs to "take responsibility for the waste it produces".

Licensing of Waste Facilities

Licences must be held by occupiers of controlled waste facilities (s.44) and persons who transport waste (s.46.1). Landfills accepting putrescible waste must be under the control of a public authority (council, Waste Board or Waste Service), but they may be operated by private companies. In this case, a supervisory licence must be held by the public authority (s.48.2) and an operating licence must be held by the operator. This supervisory licence allows the public authority to set charges for the disposal of putrescible waste at that landfill. Licences will be administered by the EPA. The EPA can amend licence conditions (s.58).

Licences for waste facilities may include conditions relating to compliance with IWRPs (s.56.d), the preparation of an environmental management plan (s.56.e), remediation (s.56.h) and financial assurances (s.56.I). A Post Closure Plan must be submitted by the licence holder three months before closing (s.59). Licences for transporters of certain wastes (sewage sludges, used tyres and hazardous wastes) may include conditions regarding times and routes permitted (s.57.a) and proper handling and disposal of waste (s.7.c).

For other wastes, generic regulations will be imposed on transporters and councils will be delegated the power to enforce these regulations.

This is in line with Local Government policy that putrescible landfills should be under the control of public authorities while the actual operation may be contracted to the private sector. Holders of supervisory licences (for example, councils, RWBs or the Waste Service) are, however, liable for offences committed by their contracted operators.

Section 58, which allows the EPA to amend licence conditions, contains no provision for the EPA to consult the relevant council/RWB to ensure compliance with the planning approval relating to that landfill. This has been a major problem for privately owned non-putrescible landfills in Sydney's west where councils have not been consulted before temporary approvals are granted for hazardous waste disposal.

Offences and Enforcement

This specifies the offences relating to illegal disposal of waste (s.63) and the penalties applicable (schedule 6).

The Act significantly broadens the powers of council employees regarding enforcement of the Act (schedule 6, page 74 of the Act). These powers are conferred through the Environmental Offences and Penalties Act (schedule 2) and the Local Government Act (s.124).

The government expects local council officers to play a greater role in ensuring that Regional Waste Plans and regulations relating to illegal dumping are enforced. The "Waste Reforms" booklet says:-

"There are presently about 4,200 certificates of registration for waste generation in the Metropolitan Waste Disposal Region. The EPA's inspectors can't visit every one of these premises on a regular basis. We need to maximise the resources of Local Government to help regulate waste generators."

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 131

Examples of waste generating premises which would benefit from local council (rather than EPA) involvement include retail, hotel, motel, commercial offices, clubs, motor dealers/repairers, warehouses and factories"(p2).

The resourcing implications for local councils are significant and do not appear to have been considered by the drafters of the policy. Can RWBs claim funding from the Waste Planning and Management Fund for the employment of Waste "Compliance Inspectors"?

The EPA has indicated that the Fund will not be available for employing additional staff and that the extension of powers to include local government officers was made in response to numerous requests from councils.

Funding

Funding for the government's Waste Policy will total \$60m over the next five years. This will involve \$35.8m over the first three years. Approximately \$8.1m has been allocated for the first year. The Council Recycling Rebate (CRR) Scheme will cease in December 1995, but there may be some residual funding until March 1996.

Operators and owners of facilities accepting waste will make contributions to the State Government under section 72. The funding formula is not specified. Under s.72(1), the policy exempts a "controlled waste facility that is used solely for the purposes of reusing and reprocessing waste as determined by the EPA" from financial contributions to the State Government and also provides for the exemption of wastes that are recycled, reprocessed or reused from the contribution calculations (s.72.5c).

A Waste Planning and Management Fund will be established (s.73) from which money may be allocated by the Minister after seeking advice from the SWAC.

There will be three types of funding provided from the fund:-

- ! funding for approved Regional Waste Plans;
- ! performance based funding determined by a clear formula; and
- ! funding for State Wide initiatives, as identified by the SWAC. This includes Industry Waste reduction Plans.

The present "sums" relating to waste are as follows:-

- | | |
|---|--|
| ! | the average annual payment from each council to the State Government under section 29 is \$151,200 @ \$72.0 a tonne; |
| ! | the total paid annually by 42 metropolitan councils to the State Government is \$6.35m; and |
| ! | the CRR scheme presently returns approximately \$4m annually to those 42 councils. |

Currently, there is a shortfall of some \$2.35m annually which is not returned to councils.

Issues Relating to Funding

An allocation of \$8.1m in the first year appears to be a substantial increase over the \$4m presently paid to councils via the CRR scheme. It should, however, be remembered that there is no guarantee that section 72 contributions will remain at the present section 29 level of \$7.20 a tonne. What will the level of section 72 funding be set at? Will it be through consultation with Local Government?

Also, unlike the present CRR funds, not all the \$8.1m will be returned to councils. It will also be allocated to state wide initiatives and the implementation of Regional Waste Plans, as well as the Industry Waste Reduction Plans. How much of the \$8.1m will actually go to councils and RWBs? The setting up and running of RWBs will be very expensive for Local Government, particularly in the initial years when it is expected that council officers will inspect and ensure compliance of premises with their RWPs.

It is also worth remembering that the funding will be spread more thinly, as councils outside the metropolitan area will also have access to the Waste Planning and Management Funds.

There is the benefit of the cost saving to be made in establishing one RWB for the Sydney area instead of four. Funds will not be wasted on duplicating administration and rents, etc.

Conclusion

Generally, the Waste Minimisation and Management Bill 1995 and the proposed policy for waste management provide many of the components which Local Government considers necessary to achieving real differences in addressing the waste crisis, through initiatives such as Industry Waste Reduction Plans and public control of putrescible waste facilities. Some residual concerns have been stated in this discussion paper and require clarification. In particular, the funding and resourcing requirements on councils are of concern. Due to time and space constraints, this paper does not address all aspects of the policy, notably the issue of landfill location and approvals. It is hoped that clarification can be provided on these and any other issues arising.

It is expected that this Bill will pass through Parliament by mid December 1995.

The required formation of RWB will be necessary in early 1996 as the RWP's are due three months, ie. March 1996, after the Bill has been passed through parliament.

The EPA has indicated that guidelines and training/meetings will be available in January 1996.

It is not considered that Council, at this stage, should adopt a position as to whether it will seek an exemption from joining a waste management region and Board. Hawkesbury is one of only two Councils in the Sydney Region which has a putrescible landfill. All others are controlled by the Waste Service. Whilst some limited government funding will be made available to the Boards there is no guarantee this will be permanent and it would seem that waste minimisation would dictate the reverse, ie. no subsidies.

Balanced against this limited funding is the increased overheads incurred as a result of being part of a region and Board. Depending upon the services undertaken by the Board, these overheads could be significant.

The best option for Council should become clearer over the next two months.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That a further report be submitted.
2. That the information be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NCX.V10

****** END OF ITEM 131 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 132

ITEM: 132

AMPOL ROAD PANTRY, RICHMOND INN HOTEL-MOTEL AND PROPOSED RICHMOND MARKETPLACE SHOPPING CENTRE - CONSTRUCTION OF A RAISED MEDIAN STRIP IN EAST MARKET STREET BETWEEN MARCH AND LENNOX STREETS

FILE NUMBER:

DA0056/95 PT03; DA0203/90 PT02/EVD

REPORT:

At Council's meeting on 14 November 1995 it was resolved that a further report be brought to the next meeting of Council in response to Item 6 of the Traffic Committee minutes which recommended as follows:

"A raised concrete median island be installed on East Market Street, Richmond, for its full length between March and Lennox Streets with the exception of that section between the northern end of the southern driveway to the Ampol Road Pantry and the southern boundary line of that property, and that the Roads and Traffic Authority be advised of Council's decision."

Condition m 41 of the Richmond Marketplace shopping centre requires that a raised central median strip be provided in East Market Street between March Street and Lennox Street at no expense to Council to the requirements of Council's Divisional Manager Engineering Operations. Alternatively, a contribution of \$20,000 be provided to Council for the construction of the raised median.

It is understood that the owners of the Richmond Inn Hotel-Motel and the Ampol Road Pantry, who currently enjoy access to both March Street and East Market Street, objected to this condition and requested that a gap be provided in the median to allow customers to turn right onto and off the site. These representations resulted in the recommendation submitted by the Traffic Committee.

The provision of a raised median strip in East Market Street has been an issue for sometime. The history is as follows:

- **June 1990** - Council receives a development application for the Ampol Road Pantry on the corner of East Market and March Streets, Richmond.
- **August 1990** - DA for Ampol Road Pantry considered by the Local Traffic Committee with a recommendation that medians be provided in March Street and East Market Street for the full length of the frontage of the development, at the cost of the applicant, and that the work be undertaken to the requirements of the Roads and Traffic Authority. This recommendation arose from Roads and Traffic Authority guidelines requiring entry to be 25 metres from traffic lights and 100 metres from a major intersection.

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 132

- **September 1990** - Ampol Road Pantry application considered by Council and resolved to approve subject to conditions including median islands to be provided in March Street and East Market Street for the full length of the site's frontage at the applicant's cost, such work being carried out to the requirements of the Roads and Traffic Authority.
- **October 1990** - Ampol Road Pantry requests reconsideration about access from March Street.
- **November 1990** - Matter reconsidered by the Traffic Committee which recommended that the Committee adhere to its previous decision for only one driveway to be provided in March Street at a minimum distance of 25 metres from the intersection.
- **December 1990** - Council reaffirms its previous decision that only one driveway be provided in March Street at a minimum distance of 25 metres from the intersection (Note: No objection from Ampol Road Pantry to the median islands in March and East Market Street).
- **August 1991** - Letter written to Ampol Road Pantry Pty Ltd advising them that the median islands had not been constructed and requesting their compliance with this condition.
- **November 1991** - Construction of the median strip in East Market Street commenced.
- **November 1991** - As a result of representations from the owner of the Richmond Inn, Council writes to Ampol Road Pantry and places a "stop work" on construction of the median strip in East Market Street pending a review of the condition of consent.
- **November 1992** - There was a question in the Local Traffic Committee regarding the installation of the median strip in East Market Street and when it would be constructed.
- **March 1993** - Traffic Committee recommends that Ampol Road Pantry be required to construct a raised median strip in East Market Street over the frontage of the site to finish at the centre of the southern entrance driveway into the Ampol Road Pantry. Such works shall be at the applicant's cost and shall be carried out to the requirements of the Roads and Traffic Authority.
- **April 1993** - Local Traffic Committee's recommendation adopted.
- **August 1993** - Report from Local Traffic Committee advising that both businesses were satisfied with a shortened median strip.
- **August 1993** - Ampol Road Pantry advise that whilst the median strip was not constructed, the contractor was paid for the work required given that Council's request to "stop work" was made on the day construction of the median strip was to commence. Consequently, they advise that there are no funds available to construct the median strip, not even for the reduced length now recommended.

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 132

- **May 1994** - Council requests RTA to fund the reduced median strip in East Market Street.
- **July 1994** - The RTA advise that as the condition of consent has not been complied with following Council's "stop work" direction, the construction of the median is a matter for Council to pursue with the developer.
- **June 1995** - Council approves Marketplace Shopping Centre with left-in and left-out access from East Market Street, subject to a condition requiring a raised median in East Market Street between March and Lennox Streets.
- **September 1995** - RTA advise that while it is prepared to allow the Richmond Marketplace Shopping Centre to have access to East Market Street, it does so on the condition that the median strip is constructed for the full length of East Market Street between March and Lennox Streets. The Authority advises that should Council or the developer fail to obtain the Authority's approval to the plans and construct the median or, alternatively, not construct the median at all, then Council will be seen by the Authority to take full responsibility should any litigation occur regarding access arrangements to the developments fronting East Market Street.
- **November 1995** - Local Traffic Committee recommend to Council a raised concrete median strip be installed on East Market Street, Richmond, for its full length between March and Lennox Streets, with the exception of that section between the northern end of the southern driveway to the Ampol Road Pantry and the southern boundary line of that property, and that the RTA be advised of Council's decision.

If Council resolves not to construct the traffic island for the full length of East Market Street, the RTA has power to refuse access to East Market Street for the proposed Marketplace Shopping Centre under the Roads Act 1993. If this were to occur, there may be potential for legal action against Council due to a forced modification of the development consent.

Notwithstanding that the consent has already been issued for the Marketplace Shopping Centre, the access onto East Market Street does improve the level of accessibility and better distribute traffic flow.

Given the position of the Roads and Traffic Authority and the consent which has been issued, there would seem no alternative other than to proceed with the median strip for the full length of East Market Street.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council endorse the provision of a raised concrete median strip for the full length of East Market Street between March and Lennox Streets.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.V13

**** END OF ITEM 132 ****

ORDINARY MEETINGMeeting Date: **12 December 1995**Item: **133****ITEM: 133** **BUILDING INSPECTION FEES****FILE NUMBER:** GS080/003 PT02/EVD**REPORT:**

Following recent changes to the Local Government Act and Approvals Regulations, investigations have been conducted by various bodies regarding the overall status of Building Fees required by Councils. Previously, the fees paid to a Council for a building application included payment for such things as:-

- (a) lodgement of the application;
- (b) processing and determination of the application; and
- (c) inspections carried out during construction.

Advice has been received from the Department of Local Government that the fees presently charged are considered to cover lodgement, processing and determination only and that Councils are able to introduce additional fees to cover the service provided to carry out inspections during construction of buildings.

Subsequently, investigations have been made into the implementation of a fee for service for building inspections and have involved the following:-

1. A survey of eight Councils in the western area of Sydney, as to whether or not fees were being charged, and if so, how much. The results of this survey are as follows:-

Name of Council	Charging Fee	Amount Per Inspection
Bankstown	Yes	\$27 Residential \$35 Commercial
Blue Mountains	Yes	*sliding scale similar to Liverpool
Baulkham Hills	Yes	\$25
Blacktown	No	
Hornsby	Yes	\$215 per application regardless of type
Liverpool	Yes	*sliding scale see below
Parramatta	Yes	\$27
Penrith	Yes	\$30

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 133

<i>Cost of BA Work</i>	<i>Fee Charged</i>
<i>*Liverpool</i>	
<i>\$1 - 10,000</i>	<i>\$65</i>
<i>10,000 - 20,000</i>	<i>\$75</i>
<i>20,000 - 50,000</i>	<i>\$120</i>
<i>50,000 - 250,000</i>	<i>\$200</i>
<i>250,000 - 500,000</i>	<i>\$250</i>
<i>500,000 - 1 million</i>	<i>\$350</i>
<i>1 million - 2 million</i>	<i>\$600</i>
<i>Each additional million</i>	
<i>over \$2m</i>	<i>\$100</i>

As can be seen from the survey the fees and methods of charging vary greatly between Councils, with Hornsby Council charging \$215 for each application regardless of type. This would mean that in Hornsby, an application for a carport which would normally only require two inspections, would cost \$107.50 per inspection.

2. The Environmental Health and Building Surveyors Association and the Australian Institute of Building Surveyors were contacted regarding the implementation of building inspection fees by Councils, and their response was that fees could be charged, with the exception of those inspections that are the subject of certification and inspection by a properly accredited person. This advice was on the basis that, whilst a Council can charge a fee for a service which it provides, it must be aware of the legal provisions involving restraint of trade.

It would be appropriate to advise applicants that they have the opportunity to use an accredited professional certifier to carry out the required inspections for them, and produce the certificates to Council, or alternatively use the services of Council's staff and pay the required fees.

3. It was also revealed during the investigations that it is necessary for a Council charging fees to be able to justify such costs, and in this regard the following aspects were considered in reaching a figure for each inspection:-
 - a. travel time and inspection time (including salary overheads);
 - b. vehicle costs; and
 - c. administrative and clerical costs.

The total cost of the above was calculated to be approximately \$25, although it was considered that this would be an average estimate, as the items considered vary greatly due to distances covered and time taken for inspections.

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 133

How Would the Inspection Fees be Applied to Hawkesbury City Council?

It is considered that the most appropriate way to administer this system would be to charge \$20 per inspection. The number of inspections required would be determined by staff from a table which will show a typical number of inspections for different types of building projects, for example:-

carport - 2 inspections required;
dwelling - 8 inspections required;
commercial/
industrial - 12 inspections required; and
dwelling
additions - 6 inspections required.
(These are only an example and are yet to be determined).

The total fee would then be calculated on the type of application proposed and would be assessed and added to the standard building application fees at the time of lodgement, or prior to the release of the approved plans.

It would also be necessary to refund any portion of the inspection fee which is not utilised during the construction, such as, if the number of required inspections assessed were not necessary for that particular project.

It is also proposed to implement a guarantee system that will give customers all their fees back should the processing of their application not be carried out within a designated time period.

The proposed time periods are as follows:-

<i>Note: building applications requiring development consent will commence their time period from the date of receipt of all outstanding development consent requirements which are required prior to release of the building application.</i>	
Minor Structures	within 72 hours of receipt
Domestic Structures	within 21 days of receipt or 30 days where public notification is required
Commercial/Industrial	within 35 days of receipt

The above will be conditional on the applicant submitting all required information with the application to allow for assessment.

If an application is inadequate in terms of the information submitted, a letter will be issued and/or a telephone call made within 7 days of receipt of the application, the time period will then recommence upon receipt of such information.

It is proposed that the funds generated by the collection of the fees be used to provide an improved service to our customers and will include but not be restricted to the following improvements to our present service:-

- ! purchase of mobile phones and two-way radios for all building surveyors, so that the public and Council administration can have continual contact with them throughout the day;
- ! commence building inspections from 7.00am each day as required. This was requested by our local builders in a recent survey;
- ! carry out inspections in all areas on a daily basis as required, not on specified days as presently happens. This will meet the needs of the public as requested in a recent customer survey; and
- ! if necessary, employ an additional building surveyor to allow the above improvements to be accommodated.

What Needs to be Done Prior to Implementing This Service Fee?

Before implementing a fee, Council must adhere to the requirements of Section 612 of the Local Government Act 1993, which states that "A Council must not determine the amount of an approved fee until it has given public notice (in accordance with section 405) of its draft management plan for the year in which the fee is to be made and has considered any submissions duly made to it concerning the draft management plan". Section 405 provides that Council must give public notice of its draft management plan after it is prepared and the period of public exhibition must not be less than 28 days. However, recent advice from the Department of Local Government states that a new fee may be introduced, outside the constraints of the management process, subject to at least 28 days public notice of the proposed fee being given so objections can be considered.

When implementing a new fee for service, Council must ensure that it provides the service in every case where it charges the fee. To do this the Building Control Section will need to monitor, on an ongoing basis, the inspections requested and carried out to ensure that the service is being performed and that Council provides sufficient resources and staff to ensure that the customers are given full satisfaction.

Accordingly, should Council support this proposal the necessary public notification would be undertaken and the result of such would be reported back to Council for consideration prior to its final decision on the matter.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that:-

1. A fee for building inspections be supported as outlined in this report.

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: **12 December 1995**

Item: **133**

2. Notice of Council's intention to implement a fee for building inspections be placed on public exhibition in accordance with the Local Government Act 1993.
3. On completion of the public exhibition process, the matter be reported back to Council for final adoption, taking into consideration any submissions from the public.
4. Should the fee for building inspections be adopted, then a priority for the funds raised should be to improve our present service generally as discussed in this report.
5. Should the new arrangements be adopted, then the new inspection hours and the service guarantee be advertised prominently at the counter and in the local press.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.V14

****** END OF ITEM 133 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 134

ITEM: 134 TOURIST/RECREATION RESORT AND COMMUNITY TITLE
SUBDIVISION PROPOSAL - "THE RIDGE", WISEMANS FERRY
ROAD, CATTAI

FILE NUMBER: GT090/003 PT07/EVD/EVD

REPORT:

At the General Purpose Committee meeting on 31 October 1995, there was a question without notice regarding the referral of this development application to the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning with a report to be submitted and notification to the Department of a likely impending submission.

Baulkham Hills Shire Council resolved at its meeting on 24 October 1995 to issue a "Deferred Commencement" approval for the development and seek the concurrence of the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning for the associated subdivision. As previously reported Baulkham Hills Shire Council did not refer the development application to Hawkesbury City Council for comment.

The development application submitted sought the construction of an integrated tourist and recreation facility. Consent was also sought for a community title subdivision of the 200 accommodation units and given the undersized allotments proposed the concurrence of the Director of Planning was required.

The application proposed the following:

- . 200 accommodation units
- . 18 hole golf course
- . golf clubhouse and pro-shop incorporating dining/conference facilities and retail shops
- . provision of Sewage Treatment Plant/Water Treatment Plant and associated utility works, stormwater ponds
- . sport/recreation facilities including a village green, tennis courts and swimming pool
- . associated "cart barn" to accommodate golf carts and parking area comprising 253 vehicle spaces (not including villa parking spaces)
- . a community title subdivision of the development and
- . it is also proposed, subject to future development applications, to construct a multi-purpose building and convert the original homestead for use as an art gallery.

The subject site is located at Cattai adjoining Wisemans Ferry Road to the south and east, Little Cattai Creek to the north and Cattai National Park to the west. Site topography is generally undulating rising to its highest point in the south adjacent to Wisemans Ferry Road and falling to the river flats adjoining Little Cattai Creek to the north. A wetland identified under State Regional Environmental Plan m 20 is located on the floodplain of Little Cattai Creek on the site.

The application raises a number of issues for the City of Hawkesbury including traffic, wastewater disposal and the potential precedent for similar types of development in the City of Hawkesbury.

Traffic

The site is bounded on the eastern and southern sides by Wisemans Ferry Road. This is a two-lane sealed road of average width 5.5 metres with 1 metre gravel shoulders. Traffic travels south to Pitt Town and McGraths Hill where the road joins Windsor Road. To the north the road leads to Wisemans Ferry.

Halcrows Road forms a "T" intersection with Wisemans Ferry Road at the south-east corner of the property. Halcrows Road is a two-lane sealed road of average width 5 metres, which joins Cattai Ridge Road at Glenorie. Cattai Ridge Road leads to Old Northern Road.

Existing traffic volumes along Wisemans Ferry Road at Cattai Creek Ridge are 1,396 vehicles per day.

It is projected that "The Ridge" development will generate 1,350 trips per day in full operation which is a significant increase on the existing traffic volume (almost 100%) but still well within the capacity of the existing road.

The development application assumes that the majority of the visitors (say 80%) will originate from the south. Of the remaining 20%, it is estimated that 10% will come from Halcrows Road. Therefore, the majority of the visitors will access the site through the City of Hawkesbury from the Pitt Town Road at McGraths Hill. Whilst the traffic generation is well within the capacity of the Wisemans Ferry Road, it will have more significant adverse effects on the intersection of Pitt Town Road and Windsor Road which is already operating with unacceptable delays.

Waste Water Disposal

The development application proposes to treat waste water in an onsite package sewage treatment plant. The treated effluent would be stored in an effluent pond and recycled for irrigation use on the golf course. Significantly, an environmental impact statement has not been prepared for the STP.

There is insufficient information in the development application documentation and report by officers of Baulkham Hills Shire Council to make a determination as to any requirement for an environmental impact statement for the STP.

Potential Precedent for the City of Hawkesbury

The application proposes that the 200 accommodation units be subdivided under community title.

In the report by officers of Baulkham Hills Shire Council, three main reasons for the subdivision were identified being:

1. To facilitate the management of the resort by defining areas and uses through community title subdivision and thereby permitting the defining of rights and responsibilities;
2. to allow separate titles to be created which will permit separate sale of various parts of the resort to investors, especially with regard to the 200 tourist accommodation units and;
3. to make the development financial viable by allowing separate sale of units to investors.

In the development application it was stated that the individual units would not be suited to long term accommodation with only two bedrooms, a relatively small kitchen and a small laundry alcove.

The development application states that the proposed golf course, club house and associated facilities would be developed in the initial stages along with some or all of the tourist accommodation.

Significantly, Baulkham Hills Shire Council accepts the overall development as a tourist facility and are seeking to have the community title subdivision approved under State Environmental Planning Policy No.1 and not a rezoning.

The overall concept and the configuration of the accommodation units suggest that the development is a tourist facility.

Conclusion

The proposed development will have traffic impacts in the City of Hawkesbury and particularly those intersections which are already at or near capacity such as the Windsor Road/Pitt Town Road intersection.

The configuration of the proposed development suggests that it is a tourist facility and not a subterfuge of the existing minimum area requirements for subdivision in that part of Baulkham Hills. As such, its potential precedent would be confined to similar tourist developments.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning be advised that Council has concerns with the traffic impacts of the proposed development on the Windsor Road and main road intersections within the City of Hawkesbury which are already at or near capacity.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.V20

****** END OF ITEM 134 ******

ITEM: 135 TENDERS - WASTE COLLECTION CAB AND CHASSIS

FILE NUMBER: GT020/300 PT01/EVD

REPORT:

Tenders were invited for the supply of a cab and chassis for the waste collection service as a replacement for one written off due to an accident.

The existing compactor body will be fitted to the new cab and chassis.

Tenders received are:

- | | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|-----------------|-----------|
| 1) | International Trucks | - | ACCOF 2350G/240 | \$133,489 |
| 2) | Volvo Truck & Bus | - | | \$150,455 |

As the existing compactor body is to be fitted, tenderers were required to include evidence from the body manufacturer that the cab and chassis and body would be compatible. Also, an ergonomic assessment of the cab and chassis was to be submitted.

Only International Trucks complied with these requirements.

Three ACCO cab and chassis are currently being used and have proven to be reliable units which are purpose built for dual control, single operator waste collection.

Funds are available for the difference in the insurance payment and purchase price by alterations to the waste plant purchase program for this year.

RECOMMENDATION:

The tender from International Trucks for an ACCOF 2350G/240 cab and chassis for an amount of \$133,489 (one hundred and thirty three thousand, four hundred and eighty nine dollars), be accepted.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.V21

****** END OF ITEM 135 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: **12 December 1995**

Item: **136**

ITEM: 136

BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT & LAND EXCHANGE PROPOSAL - LOT 1016 DP241424 NO. 41 CASTLEREAGH ROAD, RICHMOND, & ADJOINING PUBLIC RESERVE BEING LOT 1070 DP241457 - MR R W ROSE

FILE NUMBER: LEP3/95/EVD

REPORT:

Council at its Ordinary meeting of 28 February 1995, resolved to support a draft local environmental plan to permit a boundary adjustment and land exchange between Lot 1016 DP241424 No. 41 Castlereagh Road and the adjoining Public Reserve being Lot 1070 DP241457. The lots are currently zoned Residential 2(a) and Open Space 6(a) respectively.

Pursuant to Section 62 of the Act, the draft plan was referred to Sydney Water and Prospect Electricity. There were no objections to the proposal.

The Section 65 Certificate was issued by the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning and was exhibited to adjoining owners from Wednesday 25 October to Friday 24 November 1995. No submissions were received.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the draft plan be forwarded to the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning for gazettal.

ATTACHMENTS:

AT-1 Site Plan.

FN:ORC12NBX.V23

****** END OF ITEM 136 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 137

ITEM: 137 REZONING APPLICATION - LOT 11 DP803218 CNR OAKVILLE & SMITH ROAD - APPLICANT: MR & MRS P JAMES

FILE NUMBER: LEP19/95/EVD

REPORT:

An application has been received to rezone the above property at Oakville. Mr and Mrs James are proposing to purchase the site from Prospect Electricity as it is surplus to their needs. The property is currently zoned Special Uses 5(a) (substation), it has been requested that the site be rezoned to Rural 1(c) under Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 1989. The land has an area of 3,256 sq metres.

The site is owned by Prospect Electricity who have submitted the following:-

"Prospect Electricity wishes to advise Hawkesbury City Council that the subject property is no longer required for substation purposes and arrangements have been made for the property to be sold.

Accordingly, the current 5(a) Special Uses zoning is no longer appropriate, however, Prospect Electricity does not propose to lodge a rezoning application prior to the sale of the property."

No objection is raised to the proposal as the site is surrounded by lots zoned Rural 1(c), accordingly it is considered the most appropriate zoning for the site.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that:-

1. Council prepare a draft local environmental plan to rezone Lot 11 DP803218 from Special Uses 5(a) under Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 1989, to Rural 1(c).
2. An environmental study not be required in view of the relatively minor nature of the proposal.
3. Council exercise its delegation under Section 65 and 69 of the Act in respect of the proposal.

ATTACHMENTS:

AT-1 Site Plan.

FN:ORC12NBX.V24

**** END OF ITEM 137 ****

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: **12 December 1995**

Item: **138**

ITEM: 138 DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN - LOT 5, PT LOTS 3 & 1
FP977347 NO. 63 BELLS LINE OF ROAD, NORTH RICHMOND

FILE NUMBER: LEP9/95/EVD

REPORT:

At its Ordinary meeting dated 10 October 1995, Council resolved to support the preparation of a draft local environmental plan to rezone the subject property from Residential 2(a) to Business Special 3(b). The property is vacant.

The Section 65 Certificate was issued by the Director Environment and Development, as the delegate of the Director of Urban Affairs and Planning.

Adjoining owners and relevant government authorities were notified with public notification being placed in the Gazette exhibiting the plan. Three submissions have been received, raising no objections, from the Roads and Traffic Authority, Environment Protection Authority and the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning whom have advised that the plan "*may legally be made*".

The matter can now be referred to the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning for final gazettal.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:-

1. Exercise its delegation under Section 69 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. Refer the local environmental plan, Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 1989 (Amendment No. 55) to the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning for final gazettal.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.V29

****** END OF ITEM 138 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 139

ITEM: 139**FORTNIGHTLY GARBAGE COLLECTION AND RECYCLING SERVICE PROPOSAL FOR THE MACDONALD VALLEY AND COLO HEIGHTS****FILE NUMBER:** GW010/017 PT05/EVD**REPORT:**

Council currently provides a weekly 240 litre (sulo) garbage collection and recycling service to a number of outlining areas with low population densities. A weekly garbage and recycling service is provided to the Macdonald Valley from Wisemans Ferry to St Albans via main road 181 and then back to Wisemans Ferry via Settlers Road. The round trip from Windsor is 185km for which there is 195 services. The cost of providing this weekly garbage collection service has been determined as follows:-

Cost of Providing a Weekly Garbage and Recycling Service to the Macdonald Valley - 195 services over a distance of 185 kilometres

Cost Component	Cost per service per annum (\$)
Vehicle Running	149.97
Wages	38.13
Overheads	8.56
Sundry Collection Expenses	6.78
Disposal Costs	33.36
Purchase of Plant	14.11
Recycling Service	20.66 ¹
GROSS COST	271.57
Less Non Attributable Income	6.25
NET COST PER SERVICE	265.32
ADOPTED GARBAGE CHARGE	126.48
COST OF SUBSIDY	138.84

¹ This is the cost of the recycling service to Council but it would not be the cost borne by the contractor. The recycling service is also based on a flat charge throughout the City of Hawkesbury irrespective of distance per service. It is certain that the urban areas would be subsidising this figure and hence the total cost of the subsidy would exceed \$138.84

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 139

Therefore there is currently a subsidy well in excess of \$138.84 applying to each service in the Macdonald Valley and a total subsidy for the 195 services well in excess of \$27,000 per annum. It is likely that a similar result would be obtained for Colo Heights where there is a round trip of approximately 80km for approximately 80 services.

Many of the services in both the Macdonald Valley and Colo Heights are for rural properties which have numerous opportunities available for the management and disposal of putrescible material (chooks, dogs, worm farms etc). There are also numerous "weekenders", particularly in the Macdonald Valley where there is limited waste generation.

The provision of a weekly door to door garbage collection and recycling service to both the Macdonald Valley and Colo Heights is questionable on both cost efficiency and environmental grounds.

As part of the planned introduction of an optional 140 litre bin service in 1995/96 (instead of 240 litre) it is proposed that consideration be given to altering the current 240 litre weekly garbage and recycling service to the Macdonald Valley and Colo Heights to a fortnightly service. In accordance with the recent fortnightly service introduced to the Upper Macdonald, the garbage charge and vacant land charge would be reduced to 60% of the charge currently applying. Letters will be written to property owners in the Macdonald Valley and at Colo Heights advising them of the proposed fortnightly service and providing them with an opportunity to comment.

Given the distances involved and the small number of services, a fortnightly collection service for the Macdonald Valley and Colo Heights is preferable to providing an option of a reduced bin size (140 litre) and weekly collection. Both of these initiatives will assist to reduce the total volume of waste which has to be placed in landfill.

RECOMMENDATION:

Letters be written to property owners in the Macdonald Valley and at Colo Heights advising them of a proposed change in their garbage collection and recycling service from weekly to fortnightly at 60% of the applicable garbage and vacant land charge and providing them with a suitable period for comment.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.V30

**** END OF ITEM 139 ****

ITEM: 140 HAWKESBURY RIVER - RECREATIONAL WATER QUALITY

FILE NUMBER: GR060/011 PT05/EVD

REPORT:

Since October 1993 the Environment Protection Authority has monitored 12 sites within the Hawkesbury-Nepean Catchment to evaluate water quality at recreational locations.

The study monitors 6 parameters, identified in New South Wales and national guidelines as indicating water quality from the point of view of human health.

1. Faecal coliforms and enterococci (high numbers indicate possible pollution by pathogenic microorganisms of faecal origin).
2. Algal numbers (high numbers indicate loss of aesthetic appeal, odours, discolouration, weed growth and possible algal toxin production).
3. Visual clarity and colour (cloudy, discoloured water is aesthetically unappealing. Muddy water also poses a hazard through its hiding of submerged objects).
4. pH (pH <5.0 and >9.0 may cause skin and eye problems).
5. Temperature (extended exposure to water temperatures below 15°C poses a threat of hypothermia to bathers).
6. Surface films (can be aesthetically unappealing and may indicate hazardous levels of petroleum products).

The monitoring sites within the City are:

- A. Yarramundi Bridge
- B. Macquarie Park
- C. Governor Phillip Park (South Creek)
- D. Cattai National Park
- E. Sackville
- F. Lower Portland
- G. Wisemans Ferry

Guidelines make the following distinction between primary and secondary contact recreation:

- primary contact - characterised by bodily immersion or submersion where there is direct contact with the water, and includes activities such as swimming, diving and water skiing.
- secondary contact includes activities such as paddling, wading, boating and fishing in which there is some direct contact with the water but where the probability of swallowing water is unlikely.

An overall quality index combining all 6 parameters is provided to facilitate interpretation and understanding of otherwise complex data.

A report is now available for the period October 1994 to March 1995 which confirms the trends for Governor Phillip Park and Macquarie Park.

Site	Faecal Coli-forms	Algae	Clarity	pH	Temp.	Oily Films	Compliance Index
A	97/100	100/100	NM	69	100	97/97	67/97
B	33/77	100/100	0	100	100	87/87	0/67
C	67/93	100/100	0	100	100	57/57	3/53
D	93/100	85/85	NM	79	100	97/97	53/80
E	100/100	55/69	NM	90	100	100/100	60/60
F	100/100	69/88	NM	97	100	100/100	67/67
G	100/100	88/88	NM	100	100	100/100	90/90

Notes:

1. The first number in each box is the % compliance with primary contact over the monitoring period, the second is for secondary.
2. NM = not measured.

Clearly the Macquarie Park and South Creek sites are of major concern. The Environment Protection Authority does not consider that South Creek water is the cause of the high bacterial failure rate at Macquarie Park and is continuing investigations into the source of the bacteria, along with Council's staff.

Both of these locations are under the management of Council and an obligation exists to advise users that the water may not meet national guidelines for recreational use.

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: **12 December 1995**

Item: **140**

Signage is existing at Governor Phillip Park adjacent to the boat ramp advising that persons should not swim upstream of the ramp due to poor water quality. The alteration of this sign to include South Creek generally, and the provision of signage at Macquarie Park should be put in place.

The matter can be reviewed when the source of bacterial contamination of Macquarie Park is identified and rectified.

RECOMMENDATION:

Appropriate signs be provided at Governor Phillip Park and Macquarie Park advising of the water quality problems.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.V34

****** END OF ITEM 140 ******

ITEM: 141 **TENDERS - WASTE COLLECTION VEHICLE**

FILE NUMBER: GT020/301 PT01/EVD

REPORT:

Tenders were invited for the supply of a single operator waste collection vehicle to replace a crewed vehicle and to further increase the cost efficiency of the service.

Tenders received are:

1) **International Trucks**

ACCOF 2350G/240 cab and chassis with compactor body supplied by:

a)	Garpac GP23TG-S 23m ³ tip to empty	\$203,819
b)	Garpac GP23HG-D 23m ³ horizontal discharge	\$213,309
c)	Macdonald Johnston SL9322 22m ³	\$211,851
d)	Tusk - One Man Solo 19m ³	\$205,469
e)	Garwood - Smart Mark II 19-23m ³	\$208,383
f)	Transport and Waste Technologies 19m ³	\$205,679
g)	A Pakmor Waste Equipment Australia Pty Ltd 23m ³	\$198,545

2) **Volvo Truck and Bus**

Volvo TD73ES cab and chassis with compactor body supplied by:

a)	Macdonald Johnston SL9322 22m ³	\$234,713
b)	Tusk-One Man Solo 19m ³	\$228,335

3) **Cleanaway**

a)	Cab and Chassis (not specified) fitted with a 19m ³ body	\$204,580
b)	ACCO G/240 cab and chassis fitted with a 23m ³ body	\$225,806

In consideration of work safety, each tenderer was to include an ergonomic assessment of the complete unit. Any recommendations in the report are to be carried out at the expense of the successful tenderer.

Only the tender submitted by International Trucks, and the component from Garpac, complied with this part of the tender specification.

In addition the tender components from Garwood; Transport and Waste Technologies and A Pakmor Waste Equipment Australia Pty Ltd, do not comply with other parts of the specification. Three ACCO cab and chassis are currently being used and have proven to be reliable units which are purpose built for dual control, single operator waste collection.

Two bodies by Garpac are currently in use and are satisfactory units. The factory is located at Penrith which assists with servicing and repairs when necessary.

The tender from International Trucks with the Garpac GP23TG-S body will meet the tender specification.

RECOMMENDATION:

The tender from International Trucks for a ACCOF 2350G/240 cab and chassis with a Garpac GP23TG-S compactor body for an amount of \$203,819 (two hundred and three thousand, eight hundred and nineteen dollars) be accepted.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NBX.V36

****** END OF ITEM 141 ******

ORDINARY

Section 5 Reports for Information

ITEM: 142 BUSH FIRE ESTIMATES 1995/96

FILE NUMBER: GC070/001 PT7/FNC

REPORT:

Advice has been received from the Department of Bush Fire Services relating to 1995/96 Allocations.

The 1995/96 Allocation from Treasury is significantly higher than in previous. The allocation for 1995/96 is \$1,192,806 which is an increase of 30.4% over 1994/95. Council's contribution towards this allocation has increased from \$112,485 to \$146,715. Additional funding has been provided for:-

1. replacement tankers; and
2. private mobile radio networks.

The Allocation, however, is lower than that which was requested. Council, at its meeting dated 21 March 1995, resolved to seek additional funding to address the issue of plant replacement. The additional request is not provided for in the allocation for 1995/96 and, therefore, the 1% Special Rate is not required.

A revised budget in accordance with the allocation from the Department of Bush Fire Services has been developed and the adjustments will be made at the December Financial Review.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

AT-1 Fire Control 1995/96 Revised Estimates

FN:ORC12NCX.F19

****** END OF ITEM 142 ******

ITEM: 143 BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

FILE NUMBER: GC305/072 PT01/ENG

REPORT:

1995/96 Program

An amount of \$400,000 has been provided in the 1995/96 Budget for building maintenance and improvements.

The work being undertaken in this program cover general repairs, ie. painting, floor repairs, roof repairs, tiling, gutter repairs and the like, on buildings. A number of larger items in the program include modifications to Council Chambers \$10,000, carpeting of main room Windsor Library \$45,000, remainder of carpeting Richmond Library \$7,500, carpeting the remainder of the administration building \$46,700, improvements of the amenities building Memorial Park Kurrajong \$31,500, improvements to the Truck Stop Wilberforce \$18,000, improvements to the amenities building St Albans Park \$29,000, key system for Wilberforce Depot \$6,500, repair to exterior of the Toll House \$23,500, replacement of office chairs \$10,000 and modifications to Windsor Library storage area \$5,000.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NCX.E07

****** END OF ITEM 143 ******

ITEM: 144 HAWKESBURY RECREATION PLAN

FILE NUMBER: GR030/045 PT02/ENG

REPORT:

In keeping with Council's Management Plan 1995/96, a review of the Hawkesbury Recreation Plan is currently underway.

In order to obtain an accurate view of community needs and trends in recreation, a Recreation Survey has been conducted by distribution to each house hold throughout the City. Focus groups will also be targeted in the future. An example of one focus group would be a range of school children. The survey data is being analysed by WESTIR, an independent Government funded statistical analysis organisation. These results will be available for the February Corporate Planning Workshop.

In addition to the survey, an extensive inventory of recreation service providers is being compiled. Service providers would include the Sports Council, Leisure Australia, private enterprises, government departments, etc. The results of the survey and inventory will be correlated to determine shortfalls in service provision.

The aims of the plan are:-

- ! to provide a set of guidelines for Council for future planning of recreation facilities;
- ! to enable the allocation of resources according to the guidelines established;
- ! to identify and implement a standard review and evaluation procedure for all Council owned recreation facilities; and
- ! to ensure that the natural environment of the Hawkesbury is managed in such a way to maximise recreational and tourism opportunities whilst preserving that environment.

The plan will link closely with other relevant documents including Council's Access Policy, the Bushland Strategy, the Sports Council Sportsground Plan, the Plans of Management for Community Land and the Youth Services Strategic Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NCX.E27 ******* END OF ITEM 144 *******

ITEM: 145 McQUADE PARK - BORE WATER/IRRIGATION

FILE NUMBER: PK/203 PT10/ENG

REPORT:

An investigation into options of water supply for McQuade Park, has been carried out and the following report is provided for information:-

1. Town Water

The water supply throughout McQuade Park is currently town supply. This option, although common in the past, is considered not viable in the long term. The rising cost of potable water will prohibit future use for landscape purposes. A further consideration is the principle of using potable water for aesthetic quality while residential developments are being rejected because adequate water supply cannot be provided.

2. Bore Water

The option of a bore in McQuade Park was investigated and a report has been received from Intertech Drilling. Geological and groundwater data for the Windsor/South Windsor area indicate water would be available but water quality would be poor. Ground water in this area would be expected to have a high salt level. No data is available for water quality in profiles underlying the shale layers. A quote has been offered at \$12,000 to explore 150m. Intertech and the Department of Land and Water Conservation both feel this would be an exploration for data collection only. Neither feel quality water will be available in the area.

3. Treated Effluent

This option has been investigated in the past. Although there is a supply of water at McGraths Hill Treatment Plant, the cost of piping to McQuade Park is high. It is proposed to further consider the use of treated effluent on Parks in conjunction with the McGraths Hill Wetland project.

4. Sewage Mining

This option involves treatment of raw sewage to an appropriate standard directly from the sewer main and may be the most suitable for McQuade Park. Discussions are underway with Memtec in this regard and while this technology is currently under development further reporting will be provided as information becomes available.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NCX.E28

****** END OF ITEM 145 ******

ITEM: 146 WINDSOR/RICHMOND BYPASS PROPOSAL

FILE NUMBER: GR120/020 PT02/ENG

REPORT:

It was indicated that a report regarding the status of the feasibility of a bypass road from McGraths Hill to North Richmond would be reported to the November General Purpose Committee.

A plan has been prepared showing the proposed bypass route and is displayed at the meeting. The plan has recently been forwarded to the Roads & Traffic Authority for their comment and it is also proposed to distribute the plan to the Chambers of Commerce for their comment.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NCX.E32

****** END OF ITEM 146 ******

ORDINARY MEETING

Meeting Date: 12 December 1995

Item: 147

ITEM: 147 DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN - EQUESTRIAN VILLAGE,
RACECOURSE ROAD, CLARENDON - AMENDMENT NO. 40

FILE NUMBER: LEP007/94 PT01/EVD

REPORT:

Following a refusal by the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning to issue a Section 65 Certificate to allow the above draft plan to be exhibited, Council, at its Ordinary meeting of 5 September 1995, resolved that:-

"Council reaffirm its commitment to the subdivision here and representations be made to the relevant Minister and local Members of Parliament be invited to help in the response."

A reply has been received from Paul Levins, Chief of Staff of the Minister for Urban Affairs and Planning and Minister for Housing as follows:-

"The Hon Craig Knowles, MP, Minister for Urban Affairs and Planning, Minister for Housing, has asked me to respond on his behalf to Council's correspondence of 18 September 1995, regarding Hawkesbury City Council's commitment to the preparation of draft Local Environmental Plan, Amendment No. 40 to provide for an equestrian village with the minimum allotment size of 0.5ha, at Racecourse Road, Clarendon.

The Department of Urban Affairs and Planning has advised me that Council has previously sought to rezone this site to provide for residential lots with a minimum lot size of 1 hectare and that the then Minister decided not to proceed with the plan. It is my understanding that this decision was taken for several reasons. A reticulated water supply was not available for the new lots; proposed landfill may have adverse impacts on flood flows downstream; on-site disposal of effluent may result in the pollution of Rickaby's Creek in times of high rainfall; and the rezoning would create an undesirable precedent for other similarly zoned land.

The Department also advises that while the present draft LEP does address the problem of landfill by excluding low-lying flood prone land from the draft plan, it has not addressed the remaining concerns. For this reason the Director of Planning did not issue a certificate to enable the public exhibition of the draft plan. The present draft LEP could result in 66 lots (50 more than presently existing), exacerbating the problem of water provision and increasing the risk of negative environmental impacts.

Council's decision to support the equestrian village concept is understandable given the subject land's proximity to the Racecourse and Showground, however, it should be recognised that there are important issues which have to be resolved to accommodate such a development at this site.

The Minister thanks you for bringing this matter to his attention and regrets he cannot assist you further."

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information be received and no further action be taken in this draft plan at this time.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NCX.V11

****** END OF ITEM 147 ******

ITEM: 148 BLIGH PARK NORTH RESIDENTIAL RELEASE AREA -
SUBMISSIONS - HABITAT SURVEY

FILE NUMBER: LEP0011/95; LEP0016/93; DCP0005/95/EVD/EVD

REPORT:

As a consequence of the exhibition of the draft local environmental plan and development control plan for the Bligh Park North release area a number of submissions have been received from public authorities and individuals.

SUBMISSIONS BY PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

1. State Emergency Service

The submission from the State Emergency Service is of concern and reinforces comments made by representatives of the State Emergency Services at the General Purpose Committee on 28 November 1995. Because of the level of access to localities such as Windsor, South Windsor, Bligh Park and McGraths Hill, the procedure in the Hawkesbury Local Flood Plan is to evacuate the whole population if floods are expected to reach or exceed the Current Planning Level (16 metres). Whilst it is possible to achieve some slight improvement in the levels of access, major improvements are unlikely because of the very large expenditure involved and the affect on existing development.

In summary, whilst there is a detailed Hawkesbury Local Flood Plan in place, the State Emergency Service is unable to provide an assurance that the population at risk will be safely evacuated. The Service will only have an estimated 18 hours warning to evacuate a potentially flood affected population of 26,700 people, of which 12,175 are located in Windsor, South Windsor, Bligh Park, and Windsor Downs.

With the 100 people currently required in door knock teams it is estimated that the additional population in Bligh Park North would mean that evacuation could take up to about 17 hours compared with the estimated 18 hours warning. There are of course likely to be a host of unforeseen problems in evacuation; including potentially less warning time, people reluctant to leave their homes, traffic congestion, communication difficulties etc.

In the event of a recurrence of the 1867 flood of 19.2 metres, there is a definite possibility that people may be stranded in houses and on roofs despite the best efforts of the State Emergency Service.

In summary, the SES states as follows:-

" *The probability of having to completely evacuate Windsor and Bligh Park is in the order of 1:60 per annum. Your Council will have to decide whether or not the community is prepared to accept this level of risk.*

- . *If there are no flood mitigation works at Warragamba, the emergency access link (to Bligh Park) assumes greater significance than it did in 1992.*
- . *Complete evacuation of Windsor and Bligh Park will be difficult, but appears to be feasible at the moment.*
- . *Additional households proposed for Bligh Park could make such an evacuation problematical.*
- . *The SES will have to consider ways of speeding up the evacuation if Bligh Park is further developed. There is a limited number of ways in which this can be done.*
- . *The Council should not assume that the existence of a plan guarantees that a successful evacuation can be carried out."*

2. Hawkesbury Nepean Catchment Management Trust

Further to its letter of 9 August 1995, the Trust restates that it considers that the draft plan not proceed at this stage for the following reasons:-

- "1. *The development of a significant portion of land for residential purposes is inconsistent with State Government Policy. The Government's policy is not to release land below the Current Planning Level (16.0m AHD) for new urban development downstream of Warragamba Dam until a Floodplain Management Study and a Floodplain Management Plan have been completed. To date there has been no comprehensive Floodplain Management Study or Floodplain Management Plan prepared which aim to minimise the potential for damage and the risk to life and property.*

The Trust also notes that the entire site would be affected by the Probable Maximum Flood (28.9 metres AHD). The Trust considers that the risks associated with such a flood should be considered by Council as early as possible in the planning process.

2. *As a general principle the Trust considers that landforms and drainage systems should not undergo extensive modification. Accordingly the Trust is concerned about the extent of filling proposed. The draft LEP proposes to rezone areas identified as "non residential" in the background report prepared by McKenzie Land Planning Services Pty Ltd for residential purposes. The background report however indicates that these areas are "generally considered to be unsuitable for development due to drainage and natural ground levels in relation to the flood height" and should be subject to further review.*
3. *Whilst the Trust is aware that Council has resolved to provide up to \$60,000 in the 1995/96 budget to carry out environmental investigations for the Bligh Park North release area, the Trust considers that these investigations may suggest for example that an alternative layout or form of development is appropriate for the area. The investigations should also be exhibited with the draft LEP to assist in demonstrating the basis for the LEP.*

As previously indicated the Trust believes that the environmental investigations should address, inter alia, such issues as water quality and quantity, impacts on flora and fauna, visual impacts, as well as flooding.

Accordingly the Trust strongly urges Council to not proceed with the draft LEP until a comprehensive Floodplain Management Study and Plan have been completed and the environmental investigations undertaken.

The South Creek Management Committee has also expressed grave reservations about the proposed residential development proceeding. In this regard the Committee endorses the comments made above and strongly recommends that the draft LEP not proceed at this stage for the reasons indicated."

It appears that the letter from the Catchment Management Trust was written in response to the draft LEP and did not consider the contents of the draft DCP. All of the Bligh Park North area including open space, a high school and residue land not capable of development for flooding reasons was zoned Residential so as to allow some flexibility in the location of uses and to avoid the confusion which arises through the zone boundaries dissecting properties.

The draft DCP provides that there will be no consideration of urban development on land below 15.3m AHD and therefore it is not correct to say that the development of a significant portion of the land for residential purposes is inconsistent with State Government Policy. The State Government "Policy" referred to is set out in an information kit distributed in February 1994 by the previous Government and has not been separately conveyed to Council. Up to date the determination of flood policy has been on a "merits" basis.

With reference to the environmental investigations, a habitat survey of the area has now been completed which addresses the impacts on flora and fauna. The recommendation that there be environmental investigations into water quality and quantity and visual impacts is understood, but given that a sewage treatment plant to tertiary standards is already available for Bligh Park with provision for Bligh Park North it seems a potentially wasteful use of resources to investigate other alternatives. Similarly, the Bligh Park North area already contains major stormwater sediment controls provided as a part of the Bligh Park development. The development of Bligh Park North for urban purposes will have a significant visual impact compared to the existing development, however the provision of filling, generally less than a 1 metre but in some locations as much as 1.2 to 2 metres is unlikely to significantly affect the appearance of the final development. However this issue will be further considered.

3. Department of Housing

The Department owns land within the proposed release area. It raises no objection to the draft LEP and draft DCP but recommends a number of changes to aspects of the plan concerning medium density housing.

PRIVATE SUBMISSIONS

1. Claire Luland

Expresses concerns about the stability of structures on land facing Rifle Range Road between Collith Avenue and the Veterinary Clinic as it is an intermittent creek. Comments that there should be further geological and hydrogeological research before the proposal is submitted to Council.

2. Arthur Mullinger, 485 George Street, South Windsor

Objects to rezoning of Medical Centre on Rifle Range Road (the Lonsdale property) to General Business 3(a) on the grounds of the impact on the existing South Windsor shopping centre.

3. A T Cocks and Partners Pty Ltd

Applicants for the rezoning of the Lonsdale property to General Business 3(a). Support the draft LEPs and draft DCP and submit that the proposed extension of Stewart Street from the north should be continued to provide a more direct connection through to Colonial Drive (sketch attached).

4. G Parmenter, 55 Rifle Range Road

Object to proposed General Business rezoning of the Lonsdale property on grounds of existing zoned land available, affect on existing shopping centres and traffic and access problems.

5. South Windsor Development Committee, 521 George Street, South Windsor

Object to proposed General Business rezoning of the Lonsdale property on grounds of the fragmentation of retailing in South Windsor and Bligh Park.

6. Mrs M Troy, 1/59 Rifle Range Road

Welcomes proposed rezoning of Lonsdale property for shops.

7. Mr & Mrs D English, 71 Rifle Range Road

Object to proposed General Business rezoning of the Lonsdale property on the grounds of traffic, shopping needs already being met, security and alternative zoning to bushland.

CONCLUSION

Whilst the Council has supported the Bligh Park North release area on numerous occasions it is plain that evacuation of the area in the event of a flood in excess of 16 metres could be "problematical" with certainly no assurance of safety. This evacuation issue is additional to the risks of property damage for flood events in excess of the new 1 in 100 year standard of 17.3 metres.

Besides evacuation it is considered that the other issues are manageable in a development control plan.

The issue is one of balancing risk with any economic and social advantages which may accrue from the release area. It is of some significance that this area is the only remaining release area in the City of Hawkesbury on the Urban Development Program with no other areas scheduled.

On the basis that Council appreciates the risk and on balance considers the economic and social considerations of proceeding more important, the draft local environmental plan and draft development control plan will be reported to the General Purpose Committee in January 1996.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the information concerning the draft local environmental plans and draft development control plan for Bligh Park North be received.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

FN:ORC12NCX.V18

****** END OF ITEM 148 ******

ORDINARY

Section 6

Reports of Committees

Floodplain Management Committee - 1 May 1995

Minutes of the Floodplain Management Committee Meeting held in the Committee Room at the Council Chambers, Windsor, on 1 May 1995 commencing at 4.20pm.

PRESENT: Councillor L Sheather (Chairperson), Councillor B Keegan, Councillor P Minturn, Mr B Graham, Mr A Hastie, Mr J Murtagh, Mr J Miller, Mr F Khoo, Mr J Llowarch, Mr S Roberts, Mr A Becke, Mr A Low, Mr R Plough, Mr L Hayden.

APOLOGIES: Ms E Loseby.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

The Committee resolved to adopt the minutes of the meeting held on 11 April 1995.

CORRESPONDENCE:

No correspondence received.

GENERAL BUSINESS:

5.1 Flood Evacuation Routes

Councillor Sheather advised the Committee of the problem of evacuation of residents in the City with no previous experience of floods, such as the residents at Bligh Park and Windsor Downs.

The Committee discussed the need for the evacuation routes within the City to be formalised.

The SES formally thanked Council for the provision of flood maps.

The Committee was advised that evacuation route construction may be eligible for Landcare funding and that further information in this regard would be available at the Wellington Flood Conference.

The Committee discussed the importance of an early flood warning system.

The Committee resolved that a letter be forwarded to the Metropolitan Weather Bureau requesting that better information be provided for the Hawkesbury and inviting a representative to address a meeting of the Committee.

The Committee resolved to support implementation of the Disaster Plan.

The Committee resolved that a letter be forwarded to each of the Local Members of Parliament inviting them to attend the next meeting of the Floodplain Management Committee.

ORDINARY MEETING
Reports of Committees

The Committee discussed the convention of a joint meeting with the Flood Awareness Committee and the Emergency Rescue Committee.

The Committee resolved to invite a Roads & Traffic Authority senior executive to attend the next Committee meeting.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

Wednesday 28 June 1995.

The meeting closed at 6pm.

******* END OF REPORT *******

Local Traffic Committee - 17 November 1995

Minutes of the Local Traffic Committee held at the Council Offices, Windsor, on Friday 17 November 1995, commencing at 8.00am.

PRESENT: Councillor R Searle (Chairman)
Mr K Rozzoli, MP
Mr J Christie, Office of P Gibson, MP
Sgt G Thompson, NSW Police Service
Senior Constable R Banno, NSW Police Service
Mr D Lamont, Roads & Traffic Authority

An apology for absence was received from Mr G Hatch, Department of Transport.

ALSO PRESENT: Mr C Daley, Director of Asset Services & Recreation
Mr T Shepherd, Administrative Officer (Asset Services & Recreation)

MINUTES:

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 1995, were confirmed.

CORRESPONDENCE:

2. BROOS ROAD, OAKVILLE - ADDITIONAL SPEED RESTRICTION SIGNS - ROADS & TRAFFIC AUTHORITY. 266/R PT02

Advising that additional speed restriction signs will be installed on Broos Road, Oakville, as requested by Council at its meeting held on 11 July 1995.

Committee's Recommendation

That the information be received.

3. WINDSOR STREET, RICHMOND - TRAFFIC CONDITIONS - ROADS & TRAFFIC AUTHORITY. 2343/R PT04

Advising that "No Standing" signs will be erected on the northern side of Windsor Street, Richmond, for a distance of 6 (six) metres east and west of the intersection with Pitt Street, however, edge lines on the southern side of Windsor Street will not be relocated due to encroachment of vehicle travelling lane into the cycleway lane and that vehicles may cross that edge line into the cycleway lane to pass banked right turning traffic into Pitt Street under Section 66E of the Motor Traffic Act.

An oral report was given by Sgt G Thompson and Senior Constable R Banno to the effect that the cycleway symbol, as painted on the road pavement is a regulatory sign under Schedule 54(7) of the Motor Traffic Act and would appear to prohibit vehicles using that cycleway lane.

Committee's Recommendation

That clarification on the legal ramifications of the cycleway symbols, as painted on the road pavement, be sought from Council's legal advisers in light of the disparity of opinion given by the Roads and Traffic Authority and the NSW Police Service.

4. WINDSOR STREET, RICHMOND - PARKING RESTRICTIONS - ROADS & TRAFFIC AUTHORITY. 2343/R PT04

Advising that the "No Stopping/1 hr Parking" regulatory signs on the southern side of Windsor Street, Richmond, immediately east of East Market Street are not to be altered as they are standard signs, spaced at intervals well below the minimum specified distances.

Committee's Recommendation

That the information be received.

REPORTS:

5. BANDON ROAD, VINEYARD - AGED PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY SIGNAGE - HAWKESBURY CITY COUNCIL/WINDSOR COUNTRY VILLAGE. 236/R PT02

As resolved by Council at its meeting held on 10 October 1995, a plan and report were submitted in relation to appropriate advisory signage in respect of aged persons traversing Bandon Road, Vineyard.

Committee's Recommendation

1. On the western side of Bandon Road, Vineyard, undertake the following works from chainage commencing at the Chevron sign adjacent to Riverstone Railway Station:-
 - a) at Chainage 00, insert the word "aged" under the existing W6-1A advisory sign; and
 - b) at Chainage 375, erect a W6-1A advisory sign, including the word "aged".
2. On the eastern side of Bandon Road, Vineyard, insert the words "beyond crest" on existing advisory sign "aged pedestrians", at Chainage 650 from the Chevron sign adjacent to Riverstone Railway Station.

3. Investigations be initiated with City Rail regarding possible construction of footpaving on the western side of Bandon Road, Vineyard, between Riverstone Railway Station and Windsor Country Village under that Authority's rail network access programs for the aged.

6. RIFLE RANGE ROAD, SOUTH WINDSOR - TRAFFIC CONDITIONS - HAWKESBURY CITY COUNCIL/BEDE POLDING COLLEGE. 1833/R PT03

Oral report and plan of proposed regulatory signage on the northern side of Rifle Range Road, South Windsor, outside Bede Polding College to:-

1. improve sight distance to the east and west along Rifle Range Road upon egress from the College driveway immediately east of the bus-bay; and
2. increase driver vision of persons entering the pedestrian crossing adjacent to an informal bus stop.

Committee's Recommendation

Subject to inspection of that site by representatives of the NSW Police Service, the Roads and Traffic Authority and Council officers, to adopt, in principle, implementation of the following works:-

1. Install "No Stopping" zones on Rifle Range Road at the following locations:-
 - a. for a distance of 10 (ten) metres immediately east of the eastern driveway to the bus-bay; and,
 - b. for a distance of 6 (six) metres immediately west of the pedestrian crossing.
2. Install a "No Stopping" zone on the median island of the bus-bay governing the carriageway side of that median island.
3. Install a bus zone for a distance of 63 (sixty three) metres west of the proposed "No Stopping" zone referred to at 1(b) above, subject to concurrence by the Department of Transport.

7. BOSWORTH STREET, RICHMOND - LEFT TURN ONLY LANE - ROADS & TRAFFIC AUTHORITY. 255/R PT02

Proposing installation of "Left Turn Only" direction in respect of the kerbside south-bound lane of Bosworth Street, Richmond, between March and Lennox Streets.

Committee's Recommendation

That the proposal be supported.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE:

Senior Constable R Banno

1. Requested reduction of the existing speed limit of 80kph to 60kph over a distance of 700 (seven hundred) metres on Comleroy Road, Kurrajong, from its intersection with Bells Line of Road, in light of 23 (twenty three) major accidents on that section of Comleroy Road over the last 4 (four) years.

Committee's Recommendation

That the Roads and Traffic Authority be requested to investigate reduction of the speed limit on the subject section of Comleroy Road, Kurrajong, with a view to extending that reduction to East Kurrajong Road.

2. Advised of representations received from Mr A Jones regarding restricted sight distance along Castlereagh Road, Agnes Banks, upon exit from Crowley's Lane due to a large tree obscuring vision.

Committee's Recommendation

To defer further consideration of this matter pending site inspection.

3. Advised of representations received from Mr Knight requesting reduction of the speed limit on Tennyson Road, North Richmond, as well as up-grading of line-marking.

Committee's Recommendation

- a. Mr Knight's representations be noted but existing line-marking is considered adequate.
- b. Following completion of a speed survey on Tennyson Road, North Richmond, the NSW Police Service be requested to continue inclusion of Tennyson Road as part of its routine patrol.
4. Advised of vehicles crossing to the wrong side of Rifle Range Road, South Windsor, when turning left from George Street.

ORDINARY MEETING
Reports of Committees

Committee's Recommendation

That a traffic dome and 30 (thirty) metres of barrier lines be installed on Rifle Range Road, Windsor, at its intersection with George Street.

Councillor R Searle

5. Advised of representations received from Mr P Pearce regarding the incidence of speeding vehicles on Mileham Street, South Windsor, particularly south of Woods Road.

Committee's Recommendation

That a traffic survey be undertaken on Mileham Street, South Windsor, south of Woods Road.

GENERAL BUSINESS:

Councillor R Searle advised that Sgt G Thompson had been transferred from Richmond Police Station to Mt Druitt Police Station and on behalf of the Committee and administrative officers servicing the Committee, expressed appreciation to Sgt Thompson for advice and assistance given to the Committee and wished him well in his new posting.

NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting of the Local Traffic Committee will be held at 10.00am on 19 January 1996.

The meeting terminated at 9.20am.

******* END OF REPORT *******

Hawkesbury Local Economic Development Board - 1 December 1995

Minutes of the Hawkesbury Local Economic Development Board Committee Meeting held in the Committee Room, Council Offices, Windsor, on Friday 1 December 1995 commencing at 8.15am.

PRESENT: Councillor R Calvert (Chairperson), Councillor L Allan, Mr C Hanna, Mr R Tolson, Mr P Rasmussen, Mr C Dalli.

APOLOGIES: Mr B Lindsay, Group Captain M Smith, Mr G McCully, Mr M Coulter.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:

The Minutes of the meeting held on Friday 3 November 1995 were confirmed and in regard to the proposed meeting between Board Members and the Councillors, it is intended to reschedule that meeting for Tuesday 6 February 1996.

GENERAL BUSINESS:

1. Sponsorship of the Board and the Proposed Business Enterprise Centre

It was determined that potential sponsors for the Hawkesbury Local Environmental Board and Hawkesbury Business Enterprise Centre, be approached following the proposed meeting with the Councillors next February.

The list of potential sponsors was endorsed and Mr Hanna agreed to approach Prospect Electricity and the Arthur Anderson Group. Mr P Rasmussen agreed to contact Westpac, Memtec and Rural Press Ltd, with Mr Dalli to make approaches to the other potential sponsors. Councillor Allan noted that the Richmond Chamber of Commerce would provide support in the amount of \$1,000 and suggested that contact be made with the other Chambers of Commerce with a view to a joint sponsorship by the Hawkesbury Chambers of Commerce.

2. Customer Service Program

The Board supported the Customer Service Project developed by the Local Business Development Committee and an application for the funding of the project is to be lodged with the Department of Employment, Education and Training under the New Work Opportunities Program.

3. Warragamba Dam Flood Mitigation Works

The Board was of the view that the raising of the Mitigation Wall to 23 metres is critical to the future growth and development of the Hawkesbury area and as a result, resolved to seek Council's endorsement for the Board to undertake an advertising campaign highlighting the importance of raising the dam for the residents of the Hawkesbury. It was also agreed to raise this matter as a Federal issue and to seek the support of candidates for the Commonwealth Seat of Macquarie in the forthcoming election, in this regard.

It was recognised that due to the short timeframe in the leadup to the election, a special meeting of the Board may be required in January to discuss campaign strategies.

4. Our City - Our Future

The report outlining the recommendations of the Council at its Special Meeting of 7 November 1995 and in regard to the Our City - Our Future document, was received and noted. Also, it was decided to refer the recommendation number 1 of the Tourism Section go to Tourism Hawkesbury for their opinion on that proposal which links the Mainstreet Program with tourism.

5. Jobs Forum

The information in relation to the Jobs Forum held at the Windsor Leagues Club on Wednesday 8 November 1995 was received and noted, and it was also resolved that the Board monitor the ongoing progress of the jobs created as a result of the Forum, to determine the longterm benefits for the local employment market.

In this regard, a list of the companies participating in the scheme is to be obtained from the Windsor CES Office.

6. National Backpacker Tourism Strategy

The report summarising the key components of the National Backpacker Tourism Strategy was received and noted, and it was resolved that Tourism Hawkesbury be consulted to advise on measures to advance the Hawkesbury area as a backpacker destination.

7. Quality Awareness Program

The report outlining the timetable for the Quality Awareness Program being sponsored by the Board and to be held at Richmond TAFE College from next February, was received and noted, with Richmond TAFE to be also officially recognised as co-sponsors of the program.

As participant numbers are restricted to 50 - 60, it was agreed that direct approaches be made to potential course participants through the respective Chambers of Commerce and businesses operating in the area.

8. Draft Regional Environmental Study - Australian Defence Industries' Site at St Marys

The report and brochures in regard to the development of the 1,553 hectares of land currently owned by the Australian Defence Industries at St Marys was noted and the Board resolved to request Council to establish a sub-committee to report on, and liaise with, the Council, Board and the community in relation to the status and impact of the proposed development.

9. Economic Development in the United States

The article prepared by Mr Graham Apthorpe in regard to economic development in the United States was received and noted.

10. 1996 Meeting Timetable

The 1996 Meeting Timetable was adopted, with one exception being the February meeting to be transferred to Friday 9 February, which at this stage is likely to be after the Council's Corporate Weekend and the proposed meeting between Board Members and the Councillors.

11. Monthly Status Report

The items included in the Monthly Status Report were received and noted, and in regard to the Health Resort proposal being developed by Councillor Sahasrabuddhe, the Board resolved to support the referral of this project to the North Western Sydney Regional Development Organisation.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Woolworths Supermarket

Discussion took place in regard to sites being suggested for the development of a Woolworths Supermarket, with the Hollands Paddock Carpark and the existing timber yard at South Windsor being principally discussed. It was recognised that the development of a supermarket outside of the existing commercial areas of Windsor, South Windsor and/or Bligh Park would be detrimental to existing businesses in those localities.

******* END OF REPORT *******

**ORDINARY
MEETING**

Meeting Filename: OR121295.BIN

END OF BUSINESS PAPER