



# Minutes

of an Ordinary Meeting  
held at 6.00pm

16 AUGUST 2010

Note:

Minutes subject to confirmation at  
a meeting of the Council to be held on  
20 September 2010

---

## INDEX

246/2010	Confirmation of minutes
247/2010	Council workshops
248/2010	Mayor's communications
249/2010	Mayor's diary
250/2010	Pecuniary interest declarations
251/2010	Public question time
252/2010	Councillor reports
253/2010	Leave of absence
254/2010	Deputations
255/2010	Petitions
256/2010	Councillors' questions without notice
257/2010	Councillors' questions on notice
258/2010	Development & Regulatory Services determinations
259/2010	Council acting as a planning authority
260/2010	General retail and hire (Beauty Salon) – Variation to car parking and delivery area at 30 King Edward Street, Ulverstone – Application No. DA210016 (DEV)
261/2010	Residential – Dwelling at CT 147536/1 Isandula Road, Gawler Application No. DA 210027
262/2010	Public question time
Minute No. 261	continued...
263/2010	Minutes and notes of committees of the Council and other organisations
264/2010	Contracts and agreements
265/2010	Common seal
266/2010	Financial statements
267/2010	Rate remissions
268/2010	Waiving of Central Coast Resource Recovery Centre access fees – City Mission
269/2010	Application for lease of Penguin Railway Station
270/2010	Engineering Services determinations
271/2010	Unsealed Roads Policy
272/2010	Opening of various streets/roads
273/2010	Various streets/roads – Certificate of completion
274/2010	Meeting closed to the public
275/2010	Minutes and notes of other organisations and committees of the Council

---

**Minutes of an ordinary meeting of the Central Coast Council held in the Council Chamber at the Administration Centre, 19 King Edward Street, Ulverstone on Monday, 16 August 2010 commencing at 6.01pm.**

---

**Councillors attendance**

Cr Jan Bonde (Acting Mayor)	Cr Lionel Bonde
Cr John Deacon	Cr David Dry
Cr Cheryl Fuller	Cr Ken Haines
Cr Gerry Howard	Cr Tony van Rooyen
Cr Philip Viney	

**Councillors apologies**

Cr Mike Downie (Mayor) (Leave of absence)  
Cr Amanda Diprose  
Cr Brian Robertson

**Employees attendance**

General Manager (Ms Sandra Ayton)  
Director Corporate & Community Services (Mr Cor Vander Vlist)  
Director Development & Regulatory Services (Mr Michael Stretton)  
Director Engineering Services (Mr Bevin Eberhardt)  
Executive Services Officer (Mr Graeme Marshall)  
Land Use Planning Group Leader (Mr Ian Sansom)  
Town Planner (Mr Thomas Reilly)

**Media attendance**

The Advocate newspaper.

**Public attendance**

Six members of the public attended during the course of the meeting, along with ten Japanese and French exchange students with representatives from their school (Penguin High) and host families.

**Prayer**

The Meeting opened in Prayer.

---

## CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

### 246/2010 Confirmation of minutes

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“The minutes of the previous ordinary meeting of the Council held on 19 July 2010 have already been circulated. The minutes are required to be confirmed for their accuracy.

The *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005* provide that in confirming the minutes of a meeting, debate is allowed only in respect of the accuracy of the minutes.”

- Cr Howard moved and Cr Deacon seconded, “That the minutes of the previous ordinary meeting of the Council held on 19 July 2010 be confirmed.”

Carried unanimously

## COUNCIL WORKSHOPS

### 247/2010 Council workshops

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“The following council workshops have been held since the last ordinary meeting of the Council.

- . 26.07.2010 – Military museum proposition/Submission for Federal funding/Annual Report format
- . 02.08.2010 – BRA future developments/Signage Policy at Ulverstone Showground Complex/Fraud Policy
- . 09.08.2010 – Local Government Association of Tasmania issues.

This information is provided for the purpose of record only.”

- Cr Haines moved and Cr Viney seconded, “That the Officer’s report be received.”

Carried unanimously

---

## MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

### 248/2010 Mayor's communications

The Acting Mayor reported as follows:

“Eight Japanese and two French international exchange students are currently being hosted in the Central Coast area. Their attendance at this meeting of the Council provides an opportunity for the Council to formally acknowledge and welcome them.”

The Acting Mayor presented each student with a Central Coast gift pack, after which the group left the meeting.

The Acting Mayor further reported as follows:

“I am pleased to express the Central Coast community's pride in the achievements of Amy Cure at the World Junior Cycling Championships. Amy has forwarded a letter and photograph thanking the Council for its support of her campaign.”

### 249/2010 Mayor's diary

The Acting Mayor reported as follows:

“I have attended the following events and functions on behalf of the Council:

- Legislative Council Tourism Committee - informal meetings re tourism
- Ulverstone Mens Probus Club - mid-winter luncheon
- Cradle Coast Authority - Regional Planning Initiative - CKET workshop 1 (Burnie)
- Jeremy Rockliff MP - meeting re Central Coast issues
- Senator the Hon Richard Colbeck and Garry Carpenter, Federal Liberal Candidate for Braddon - briefing re Strategic Priorities 2010
- Sid Sidebottom MP, Federal Member for Braddon - briefing re Strategic Priorities 2010
- Local Government Association of Tasmania - General Meeting (Launceston)
- Cradle Coast Authority - Regional Planning Initiative - CKET workshop 2 (Burnie)
- Devonport Chamber of Commerce & Industry - Federal electorate forum for Braddon candidates (Devonport)
- University of Tasmania - Foundation Dinner on the Coast
- Ulverstone Basketball Association - annual dinner

- 
- . Ulverstone Anglers Club - annual dinner
  - . Memorial service for the late Judy Liauw, former Tasmanian Pharmacy Guild President
  - . State funeral for the late Sue Napier, former Deputy Premier
  - . Telstra - launch of Next G network base station in Penguin
  - . Samaritan's Purse Australia - Operation Christmas Child 2010 NW Tasmania launch.

Cr Brian Robertson has represented me at the following event:

- . Ulverstone Primary School - official opening of Building the Education Revolution Project.

Cr Lionel Bonde has represented me at the following event:

- . Lions Club of Forth Valley - annual awards and Board presentation night.

Cr Cheryl Fuller has represented me at the following events:

- . Apex Club of Ulverstone - changeover dinner
- . Eliza Purton Limited Auxiliary - annual soup and sandwich luncheon
- . Surf Life Saving Tasmania - 2010 Awards of Excellence
- . QantasLink Cradle Coast Regional Tourism Forum - awards dinner.

Cr John Deacon has represented me at the following event:

- . QantasLink Cradle Coast Regional Tourism Forum - welcome cocktail party.

Cr Gerry Howard has represented me at the following event:

- . Eliza Purton Home for the Aged, Coroneagh Park Auxiliary - annual general meeting
- . Uniting Church in Australia - induction of Rev. Brian Cole as minister of Mid North West Regional Uniting Church."

- Cr Deacon moved and Cr Haines seconded, "That the Acting Mayor's report be received."

Carried unanimously

## **250/2010 Pecuniary interest declarations**

The Acting Mayor reported as follows:

---

“Councillors are requested to indicate whether they have, or are likely to have, a pecuniary interest in any item on the agenda.”

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“The *Local Government Act 1993* provides that a councillor must not participate at any meeting of a council in any discussion, nor vote on any matter, in respect of which the councillor has an interest or is aware or ought to be aware that a close associate has an interest.

Councillors are invited at this time to declare any interest they have on matters to be discussed at this meeting. If a declaration is impractical at this time, it is to be noted that a councillor must declare any interest in a matter before any discussion on that matter commences.

All interests declared will be recorded in the minutes at the commencement of the matter to which they relate.”

Cr Fuller reported as follows:

“I will be declaring an interest in respect of an application for lease of the Penguin Railway Station (Minute No. 269/2010).”

## **251/2010 Public question time**

The Acting Mayor reported as follows:

“At 6.40pm or as soon as practicable thereafter, a period of not more than 30 minutes is to be set aside for public question time during which any member of the public may ask questions relating to the activities of the Council.

Public question time will be conducted as provided by the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005* and the supporting procedures adopted by the Council on 20 June 2005 (Minute No. 166/2005).”

## **COUNCILLOR REPORTS**

### **252/2010 Councillor reports**

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

---

“Councillors who have been appointed by the Council to community and other organisations are invited at this time to report on actions or provide information arising out of meetings of those organisations.

Any matters for decision by the Council which might arise out of these reports should be placed on a subsequent agenda and made the subject of a considered resolution.”

Cr Howard reported on the Riana Community Centre Committee’s annual general meeting re-scheduled to 1 September 2010.

Cr (L) Bonde reported on the meeting this day of Cradle Coast Water.

#### **APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

##### **253/2010 Leave of absence**

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“The *Local Government Act 1993* provides that the office of a councillor becomes vacant if the councillor is absent without leave from three consecutive ordinary meetings of the council.

The Act also provides that applications by councillors for leave of absence may be discussed in a meeting or part of a meeting that is closed to the public.

There are no applications for consideration at this meeting.”

#### **DEPUTATIONS**

##### **254/2010 Deputations**

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“No requests for deputations to address the meeting or to make statements or deliver reports have been made.”



---

## PETITIONS

### 255/2010 Petitions

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“No petitions under the provisions of the *Local Government Act 1993* have been presented.”

## COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS

### 256/2010 Councillors' questions without notice

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“The *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005* provide as follows:

- '29 (1) A councillor at a meeting may ask a question without notice of the chairperson or, through the chairperson, of –
  - (a) another councillor; or
  - (b) the general manager.
- (2) In putting a question without notice, a councillor must not –
  - (a) offer an argument or opinion; or
  - (b) draw any inferences or make any imputations –  
except so far as may be necessary to explain the question.
- (3) The chairperson must not permit any debate of a question without notice or its answer.
- (4) The chairperson, councillor or general manager who is asked a question without notice may decline to answer the question.
- (5) The chairperson may refuse to accept a question if it does not relate to the activities of the council.

- 
- (6) Questions without notice, and any answers to those questions, are not required to be recorded in the minutes.
  - (7) The chairperson may require a councillor to put a question without notice in writing.'

If a question gives rise to a proposed matter for discussion and that matter is not listed on the agenda, Councillors are reminded of the following requirements of the Regulations:

- '8 (5) Subject to subregulation (6), a matter may only be discussed at a meeting if it is specifically listed on the agenda of that meeting.
- (6) A council by absolute majority... may decide at an ordinary meeting to deal with a matter that is not on the agenda if the general manager has reported –
  - (a) the reason it was not possible to include the matter on the agenda; and
  - (b) that the matter is urgent; and
  - (c) that (qualified) advice has been provided under section 65 of the Act.'

Councillors who have questions without notice are requested at this time to give an indication of what their questions are about so that the questions can be allocated to their appropriate Departmental Business section of the agenda."

The allocation of topics ensued.

## **257/2010 Councillors' questions on notice**

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

"The *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005* provide as follows:

- '30 (1) A councillor, at least 7 days before an ordinary meeting of a council or council committee, may give written notice to the general manager of a question in respect of which the councillor seeks an answer at that meeting.
- (2) An answer to a question on notice must be in writing.'

---

It is to be noted that any question on notice and the written answer to the question will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting as provided by the Regulations.

Any questions on notice are to be allocated to their appropriate Departmental Business section of the agenda.

No questions on notice have been received.”

**DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS**

DEVELOPMENT & REGULATORY SERVICES

**258/2010 Development & Regulatory Services determinations**

The Director Development & Regulatory Services reported as follows:

“A Schedule of Development & Regulatory Services Determinations made during the month of July 2010 is submitted to the Council for information. The information is reported in accordance with approved delegations and responsibilities.”

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“A copy of the Schedule has been circulated to all Councillors.”

■ Cr Deacon moved and Cr Dry seconded, “That the Schedule of Development & Regulatory Services Determinations (a copy being appended to and forming part of the minutes) be received.”

Carried unanimously

**259/2010 Council acting as a planning authority**

The Acting Mayor reported as follows:

“The *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005* provide that if a council intends to act at a meeting as a planning authority under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, the chairperson is to advise the meeting accordingly.

The Director Development & Regulatory Services has submitted the following report:

‘If any such actions arise out of Minute Nos 260 and 261/2010, they are to be dealt with by the Council acting as a planning authority under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.’”

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“Councillors are reminded that the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005* provide that the general manager is to ensure that the reasons for a decision by a council acting as a planning authority are recorded in the minutes.”

- Cr Haines moved and Cr Viney seconded, "That the Acting Mayor's report be received."

Carried unanimously

**260/2010      General retail and hire (Beauty Salon) – Variation to car parking and delivery area at 30 King Edward Street, Ulverstone – Application No. DA210016 (DEV)**

The Director Development & Regulatory Services reported as follows:

<i>“DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO.:</i>	DA210016 (DEV)
<i>APPLICANT:</i>	Silvia Bell
<i>LOCATION:</i>	30 King Edward St, Ulverstone
<i>ZONING:</i>	Business
<i>PLANNING INSTRUMENT:</i>	Central Coast Planning Scheme 2005 (the Scheme)
<i>ADVERTISED:</i>	31 July 2010
<i>REPRESENTATIONS EXPIRY DATE:</i>	14 August 2010
<i>REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:</i>	Nil
<i>42-DAY EXPIRY DATE:</i>	30 August 2010
<i>DECISION DUE:</i>	16 August 2010

*PURPOSE*

The purpose of this report is to consider an application for a beauty salon at 30 King Edward Street, Ulverstone. The Council is required to exercise discretion in allowing for a variation to the permitted car parking and delivery area requirements of the Scheme.

*BACKGROUND*

Annexure 1 is a copy of the application. Annexure 2 is a location plan.

The site was previously used as a dental surgery.

A discretionary planning application is required on the basis that the proposal does not meet the Scheme's permitted requirements for car parking and a delivery area.

*DISCUSSION*

The following table is an assessment of the relevant Scheme provisions:

<i>CLAUSE</i>	<i>ASSESSMENT AND COMMENT</i>
2.0 Objectives for Planning 2.1(a)	<p>Complies.</p> <p>Proposal is an existing commercial activity located within the existing urban area.</p>
12.1 Zone purpose	<p>Complies.</p> <p>Retail activity is consistent with the purpose of the Business Zone.</p>
12.2.1 Use table	<p>Complies.</p> <p>General retail and hire is a permitted use in the Business Zone.</p>
12.4.3 Building design and siting	<p>Complies.</p> <p>The proposal is for a beauty salon in an existing retail building on the site. The existing building is less than 10 metres in height, has a frontage with compliant glazed and wall areas and has a recessed entry point. An entry ramp providing access to the front door further increases the recessed entry point.</p>
12.4.4 Building access and services	<p>Complies.</p> <p>The building is connected to all the required services; road, water, reticulated sewage, reticulated stormwater, telecommunications and electricity.</p> <p>There is no new vehicular access or change to the existing access proposed as part of this application.</p>
12.4.5 Crime prevention	<p>Complies.</p> <p>There is no change proposed to the existing front entrance of the existing shop. The existing entrance to the building is visible from King Edward Street, the entrance area is visible from within the building while artificial street lighting illuminates the entrance at night.</p>

12.4.6 Delivery areas	<p>Does not comply.</p> <p>No designated area which is separated from public access is provided for the loading and unloading of goods. The proposal relies on Performance Criteria (12.4.6 P2) to achieve compliance with the Scheme's delivery area requirement.</p>
12.4.6 P2	<p>Complies</p> <p>There is a car parking area available on the site which will provide for the loading and unloading of goods associated with the proposal. It is understood that goods will be delivered on a once per week basis from an Australia Post vehicle and/or courier. Additionally, loading zones are provided in King Edward Street in reasonable proximity to the subject site.</p>
12.4.7 Refuse areas	<p>Complies.</p> <p>The existing shop building has adequate internal refuse storage facilities.</p>
<i>RELEVANT SCHEDULES</i>	
S11.0 Car parking	<p>Does not comply.</p> <p>There are currently two car parking spaces provided at the front of the site, while an additional four car parking spaces have historically been provided on a leased 144m<sup>2</sup> property to the immediate West of the subject site. It is intended that this site will continue to be leased in association with the subject site. Accordingly, the site has existing use rights for 6 car parking spaces.</p> <p>For the type of development proposed, the Car Parking Schedule requires the following onsite carparking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. 1 space for every employee (2 employees proposed) = 2 spaces;</li> <li>. 7 onsite car parking spaces per 100m<sup>2</sup> of net floor area (69.14m<sup>2</sup> of net floor area) = 5 spaces.</li> </ul>

	<p>Therefore the Scheme requires 7 car parking spaces for the development to maintain a permitted status. The site has existing use rights for 6 carparking spaces, leaving a shortfall of 1 carparking space.</p> <p>The relevant Performance Criteria of the Car Parking Schedule allows for a variation in the standard number of the car parking spaces where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) there is no adverse effect on the streetscape;</li> <li>(ii) the number or size of vehicles will not create a traffic hazard or create on-street parking congestion; and</li> <li>(iii) there is no adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding locality.</li> </ul> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed beauty salon will not result in the intensification of, or substantive change to the previous use of the building as a dental surgery. Accordingly, and taking the above Scheme provisions into consideration, the existing parking circumstances, the streetscape and the amenity of the surrounding locality will not be adversely affected.</p> <p>A relaxation of the parking requirements can be granted on this basis, but a cash-in-lieu payment for each space may be taken by the Council up to a value of \$11,000 per space.</p> <p>Given that the proposed development will not result in any material change to the current retail activity on the site, it may not be reasonable to require a cash-in-lieu contribution for the parking space which is not provided.</p>
--	---

*CONSULTATION*

In accordance with s.57(3) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*:

- . a site notice was posted;
- . letters to adjoining owners were sent;



- . an advertisement was placed in the Public Notices section of The Advocate newspaper.

No submissions were received.

The application was referred to the Council's Planning and Assessment Team. Any relevant comments received from the Planning and Assessment Team are included in the recommendation of the application.

*IMPACT ON RESOURCES*

This report has no impact on resources other than the usual resources in assessment of the application and preparation of a report. Additional resources required in the event of an appeal are unknown.

*CORPORATE COMPLIANCE*

The Central Coast Strategic Plan 2009–2014 includes the following strategies and key actions:

The Shape of the Place

- . Adopt an integrated approach to land use planning

The Environment and Sustainable Infrastructure

- . Contribute to a safe and healthy environment

The proposal is consistent with these strategies and key actions.

*CONCLUSION*

The proposed development adequately complies with the all the relevant development requirements of the Scheme. A discretionary planning application was triggered on the basis that the development does not comply with permitted standards of the Scheme relating to car parking and delivery area. In accordance with the above assessment it is recommended that the Council exercise discretion for the delivery area. Further, it is recommended that the Council waive the required 1 carparking space.

*RECOMMENDATION*

It is recommended that the application is approved, with the conditions and notes listed below:

### General

- 1 The development must be in accordance with the plans and information submitted as part of the application for this permit;
- 2 The 144m<sup>2</sup> carparking area located on 28A King Edward Street and shown in the plans submitted as part of the application, must remain leased by the permit holder for use associated with the approved activity.

### Please note:

- A This permit expires two years from the date advice of this decision is received unless the development has been substantially commenced. An extension of time to this period may be granted once only, but only if the request is received prior to the expiry of the specified time. Substantial commencement will be considered to be the lodgement of a building permit application.
- B In relation to Condition 2, should the lease of the 144m<sup>2</sup> carparking area located on 28A King Edward Street cease, a discretionary planning application must be submitted to the Council for a further variation of the Central Coast Planning Scheme's carparking requirements.
- C Building and plumbing permits are required for the proposed development.
- D Registration and licensing with Council will be required under the *Public Health Act 1997* if any public health risk activities (ie. electrolysis, ear or body piercing) is conducted on the site."

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

"Copies of the Annexures referred to in the Director's report have been circulated to all Councillors."

- Cr Haines moved and Cr (L) Bonde seconded, "That Application No. DA210016 (DEV) be approved subject to the following conditions and notes:

### General

- 1 The development must be in accordance with the plans and information submitted as part of the application for this permit;

- 2 The 144m<sup>2</sup> carparking area located on 28A King Edward Street and shown in the plans submitted as part of the application, must remain leased by the permit holder for use associated with the approved activity.

Please note:

- A This permit expires two years from the date advice of this decision is received unless the development has been substantially commenced. An extension of time to this period may be granted once only, but only if the request is received prior to the expiry of the specified time. Substantial commencement will be considered to be the lodgement of a building permit application.
- B In relation to Condition 2, should the lease of the 144m<sup>2</sup> carparking area located on 28A King Edward Street cease, a discretionary planning application must be submitted to the Council for a further variation of the Central Coast Planning Scheme's carparking requirements.
- C Building and plumbing permits are required for the proposed development.
- D Registration and licensing with Council will be required under the *Public Health Act 1997* if any public health risk activities (ie. electrolysis, ear or body piercing) is conducted on the site."

Carried unanimously

**261/2010 Residential – Dwelling at CT 147536/1 Isandula Road, Gawler  
Application No. DA 210027**

The Director Development & Regulatory Services reported as follows:

"The Land Use Planning Group Leader has prepared the following report:

<i>'DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO.:</i>	DA 210027
<i>APPLICANTS:</i>	Stuart Edwards and Anna Robinson
<i>LOCATION:</i>	CT 147536/1 Isandula Road, Gawler
<i>ZONING:</i>	Rural Resource
<i>PLANNING INSTRUMENT:</i>	Central Coast Planning Scheme 2005 (the Planning Scheme)
<i>ADVERTISED:</i>	31 July 2010
<i>REPRESENTATIONS EXPIRY DATE:</i>	14 July 2010
<i>REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:</i>	One
<i>42-DAY EXPIRY DATE:</i>	10 September 2010
<i>DECISION DUE:</i>	16 August 2010

### *PURPOSE*

The purpose of this report is to make a determination on an application for a residential dwelling and shed on the property at CT 147536/1 Isandula Road, Gawler.

### *BACKGROUND*

It is proposed to erect a 334m<sup>2</sup> dwelling and shed (outbuilding) on a 10.66 ha lot which is currently used as farmland to grow cattle. The land is cleared and in pasture, and contains a water storage dam. There are no other dwellings or buildings on the land.

The development would be sited well back from Isandula Road, relatively close to three other houses (143, 153 and 154 Isandula Road) plus another two within about 500m. The adjacent houses are each on relatively small lots i.e. 143 – 1.67 ha; 153 – 4047 m<sup>2</sup>; and 154 – 2.27ha. A location plan is provided at Annexure 1.

The applicants lodged a previous application on the 9 June 2010 which was withdrawn prior to its consideration by the Council. That proposal was for the same dwelling with use of the remainder of the land for a hobby farm. The proposal was assessed as an application for a dwelling under section 15.4.3 Protection of Agricultural Land, of the Planning Scheme, particularly Acceptable Solution A2 and Performance Criteria P3.

The proposal was regarded as failing A2 (c) in that the dwelling would be closer than 100m to agricultural land on another lot, and P2 (a) and (b) in that the dwelling was not on a lot of a size or configuration impractical for agricultural use, and would not be on a lot that is practically incapable of inclusion with any other agricultural land whether in the same ownership or not.

The current application comprises the same house proposal but is applied for as an integral and subservient use to the Resource development use of the property, pursuant to clause 4.6 Multiple Use, sub clause 4.6.1 which says:

“4.6.1 A use or development on a site which is an integral and subservient part of a principal use on that site must be categorised as the same use as the principal use”.

The applicants have provided a business plan in which they forecast financial returns for cattle raising on the property and outline their case for needing a house on the land as part of the cattle-raising operation.

A copy of the current application is appended as Annexure 2.

*DISCUSSION*

In determining compliance with the relevant provisions of the Planning Scheme, regard is given to:

- . The objectives for planning as set out in Part A of the Planning Scheme;
- . The purpose of the Rural Resource zone; and
- . The relevant Acceptable Solutions and Performance Criteria.

The proposal's performance against the relevant Acceptable Solutions and Schedules of the Planning Scheme, is outlined as follows:

*Acceptable Solutions*

	<i>PROPOSED</i>	<i>REQUIRED</i>
15.4.3 Protection of agricultural land (A3)	Non – compliant: Lot less than 50ha. No other dwelling on the lot.	Required lot area of 50ha on which there is no other dwelling.
15.4.4 Building height (A1 and A2)	Compliant: Dwelling: 4.9m. Outbuilding: 3.264m.	8m – residential. 10m – all other buildings.
15.4.4 Setbacks (A3)		
. Front	Compliant: Dwelling: 60m Outbuilding: 42m	10m
. Side	Compliant: Dwelling: 220m and 10.18m Outbuilding: 10.38m	3m

<p>Rear</p>	<p>Compliant:</p> <p>Dwelling: 340m</p> <p>Outbuilding: 370m</p>	<p>10m</p>
<p>15.4.4 Cladding (A4)</p>	<p>Unknown:</p> <p>Can be made a condition.</p>	<p>Non-reflective external cladding or screened from public view.</p>
<p>15.4.5 (A1) Access &amp; services</p>	<p>Isandula Road is Municipal standard road.</p> <p>On-site management possible.</p> <p>On-site disposal possible.</p>	<p>Access to Municipal standard road.</p> <p>On-site wastewater management system.</p> <p>On-site stormwater disposal.</p>
<p>15.4.6 (A1-4) Wetlands &amp; watercourses</p>	<p>Complies:</p> <p>No direct modification of a wetland or water-course.</p> <p>Complies:</p> <p>Natural flow of Gawler River unlikely to be affected – house is over 340m away.</p> <p>Complies:</p> <p>Natural erosion/sedimentation patterns associated with Gawler River unlikely to be affected – house is over 340m away.</p> <p>Complies:</p> <p>No vegetation removal within 30m of the Gawler River is proposed.</p>	<p>Wetland or watercourse not to be filled, drained or adversely affected.</p> <p>Natural flow to/from a wetland or watercourse not adversely affected.</p> <p>No increase in erosion or sedimentation caused to wetland or water-course.</p> <p>Native vegetation not to be removed within 30m of a wetland/water-course.</p>

*Applicable Schedules*

	<i>PROPOSED</i>	<i>REQUIRED</i>
S1 Application requirements	Complies:  All relevant material supplied.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Applicant's contact details.</li> <li>. Copy of Certificate of Title.</li> <li>. Completed application form.</li> <li>. Payment of fees.</li> <li>. Site assessment.</li> <li>. Site plan.</li> <li>. Internal layout of buildings.</li> <li>. Elevations.</li> <li>. External finishes.</li> </ul>
S2 Road & rail  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Sight Distance S1.5.1</li> <li>. Accesses S1.5.3</li> </ul>	Non-compliant:  South: 190m.  North: 60m – realignment of the front fence (northern side of access) the sight distance can be increased to 115m.  1 x 2-way access.	115m (based on 60km/h speed).          1 x 2-way access or 2 x 1-way accesses.
S4 Bushfire prone areas S4.4.2 Dwelling unit design	N/A  Dwelling not within 100m of vegetation of more than 1ha.	Applies to land with vegetation of at least 1ha, or within 100m of land with vegetation of at least 1ha.   Building Protection zone: N/A  Fuel Modified buffer zone: N/A

S11 Car parking		
S11.3.1 Car parking provision (A1) and (A2)	Compliant: 2 spaces.	In accordance with Table S10.3.2: 2 spaces.
S11.3.3 Car park design & construction (A1)	Non-compliant: Could be made a condition.	Design to comply with AS 2890.1-1993 Off Street Parking Part 1 - Car Parking Facilities.
S11.3.3 Car park design & construction (A2)	Non-compliant: Could be made a condition.	Paving material to provide all-weather access.

*Use*

The principal issue relating to the proposal is whether the proposed dwelling and outbuilding are integral and subservient to the operation of the property as a legitimate rural resource use.

On this question the applicants' business plan makes various points, summarised as follows:

Physical

- 1 The property is currently used for "growing out" beef cattle. The absence of a dwelling on the land makes it difficult for current owners to continue the practice.
- 2 The property has a dam in a watercourse on the property, a spring and a water licence to take 3,000 MI from the Gawler River, plus an option to lease 12,000 MI from a neighbour.
- 3 Soil is reasonably fertile and classified as Class 4 agricultural land.
- 4 Existing improvements are fences and steel holding yard with loading ramp.



Operation

- 5 Viability is increased by availability of another 9ha leased from a neighbour.
- 6 Aim of operation is to “turn off approximately 20 head of quality cross bred beef cattle each year, with an average turnover of approximately \$20,000 per annum”.
- 7 Intends to buy 10 weaners and 10 yearlings per year to grow out and turn off steers that are approximately 500–600kg.
- 8 The operation would be labour intensive involving hand rearing and weaning calves and hand feeding twice per day.
- 9 The owners live in Devonport and it would be impractical for them to drive from there twice a day to check stock.
- 10 A shed will be erected on the land to house machinery to be used in the operation, e.g. a tractor.
- 11 Surrounding agricultural land would not be fettered by the proposed dwelling and the proposed dwelling site would only equate to an area required for running one steer – the benefits of the dwelling on-site outweigh the loss of that land.

Risk management

- 12 Risks regarding the proposed operation would be lessened through having a dwelling on the land because:
  - direct monitoring of livestock; and
  - direct monitoring of the farm environment;would be possible.

Financial analysis

- 13 A financial analysis indicates that net profit from the operation would increase from \$7,519 in 2011 to \$14,715 in 2015. These profits exceed DPIPWE gross margins. The operation would be as financially successful on the property as any other agricultural use could be.

The business plan contains a map which includes an additional 8.8ha of neighbouring land. The applicants indicate that the neighbouring land may be available for them to lease and have based their plan on this assumption. However there is no evidence that the applicants have a commitment to lease the additional land.

Establishing whether the proposed operation is viable goes to the heart of whether a dwelling should be considered integral and subservient. Advice on the applicants' claims was reviewed by a qualified agricultural scientist, engaged by the Council to provide specialist advice on the likely viability of the operation and its compliance with the Performance Criteria under 15.4.3 Protection of Agricultural Land (P3).

On the question of whether the operation is likely to be viable, the Council's agricultural consultant provided the following advice:

- . The business plan over-estimates the carrying capacity of the block (particularly as over half the pasture is unimproved) together with an under-estimate of the feed requirements for the sustained target growth leads to an over-statement of the likely returns and net profit.
- . The viability of an agricultural enterprise is best assessed by its return on investment. This proposal will not meet that requirement, particularly if the cost of the land together with the house and buildings are taken into account.
- . "Lifestyle values" may be important to the proponent but that value is not considered within the everyday meaning of the "viability" of an enterprise.

On the basis of this advice, it would be reasonable to conclude that the proposed operation is unlikely to be viable in its current form; at least its viability is questionable. Consequently, the argument that a dwelling is required as part of a legitimate farming operation is also open to question. Failure of the agricultural operation would result in the existence of another dwelling in the rural area, with the potential to further frustrate the future development of the industry and the viability of surrounding agricultural properties.

### *Assessment against Planning Scheme*

The first provision against which the application is assessed is 15.4.3 Protection of Agricultural Land. The proposal does not meet the Acceptable Solution (AS) in that the lot size of 10.66ha is less than the required 50ha.

Non-compliance with the AS triggers an assessment against the Performance Criteria (P3), in particular:

- (a) the dwelling must be integral and subservient to ..... animal breeding, boarding or training ....;
- (b) whether it is sited on prime agricultural land; and
- (c) whether it would be likely to fetter agricultural use of agricultural land.

#### Integral and subservient

The consultant addressed whether the proposed dwelling could be reasonably considered integral and subservient to the proposed enterprise. He indicates:

- . Normal small-holding beef enterprises do not require the daily presence of the owners or a necessity to live on the land.
- . The applicants' proposal rests on the hand rearing of calves to weaning. Hand rearing of calves is specialised and requires much experience which most small-holders do not have.
- . This part of the plan is ill-advised. The daily presence of owners on the block is not critical for their enterprise.

The knowledge and abilities of the owner in cattle rearing are unknown and are not questioned. However, the claim that it is necessary to live on the site to undertake this type of enterprise is doubtful given the consultant's conclusions. Consequently the claim that the owner's dwelling would be integral and subservient to the cattle business must be considered unproven.

#### Prime agricultural land

On the matter of whether the dwelling site is prime agricultural land, the applicants' professional advice in relation to the former application, was that the land is Class 4. Evidence for this classification was not provided in the report but appears to be based on another consultant's reading of a 1:100,000 scale map prepared by the former DPIF. Advice to Council from those who prepared the Land Capability Survey and associated map, is that the 1:100,000 scale map is not adequate to determine land classification on a particular site.

At this stage it is not possible to say with a high degree of assurance that the land is not prime agricultural land. The consultant concurs with this view

and recommends that should the proposal be further considered an assessment should be undertaken to a scale of 1:2,000 to best answer the question.

#### Fettering

Fettering of neighbouring agricultural land was addressed by the applicants' consultant in his report prepared for the previous application. The report said of the proposed dwelling site "Such a location is in our opinion, taking into account water catchments, buffer zones and adjoining dwellings (next door) unlikely to affect adjoining agricultural land".

A justification for this view was surprisingly absent from the report. The matter is better addressed by the applicants in their business plan where they make the following points:

- 1 The property to the south is located approximately 200m from the proposed dwelling. This distance would allow for the use of irrigators, tractor sprayers, etc without affecting the dwelling.
- 2 The property to the north-west is currently leased by the current owner of the subject site: the applicants propose to lease the same land for their operation. Consequently the land would not be fettered.
- 3 The loss of agricultural land on the subject lot, occupied by the proposed dwelling, would correspond to running one steer. The loss would be offset by the advantages of living on site.

The property to the east of the subject land (across Isandula Road) has not been considered by the consultant or the applicants. It is within 100m of the house site but could be afforded some limitation on any fettering effects by the presence of Isandula Road.

The agricultural consultant says that low-intensity grazing like that proposed would not be fettered by the proposed house, but the location of the proposed shed may be too close to the dwelling for health purposes. And unless the nearby land is used for intensive horticulture or cropping, then the proposed dwelling should not fetter the agricultural use of that land. There should also be no significant effect to the water course or water quality caused by the dwelling.

The impact of the proposed dwelling through the fettering of surrounding agricultural uses is likely to be minimal if the nature of existing agricultural

operations remains the same. However some fettering could result if changed to intensive horticulture or cropping.

Associated buildings and infrastructure

Performance Criteria P3 (d) requires that a dwelling be developed after all buildings and infrastructure associated with the use to which it is integral and subservient have been approved and established.

Council's agricultural consultant indicates that the proposed shed would be adequate for the hand rearing of calves, but that this activity can be noisy and smelly and could be fettered by its closeness to the existing residences to the north. He suggests that if the activity is proceeded with then a specific calf-rearing shed be built elsewhere on the property.

The required buildings and infrastructure have not yet been approved or established. This should occur prior to construction of the proposed dwelling, to be consistent with the Planning Scheme requirement.

*Departmental advice*

Advice from the various Departments of Council is provided as follows:

<i>DEPARTMENT</i>	<i>ADVICE</i>
Corporate & Community Services . Administration . Community Development	No issues.  No issues.
Development & Regulatory Services . Building & Plumbing . Environmental Health	Building and plumbing permits required.  The following conditions are to be applied to any approval:

	<p>1 A separate application detailing the design and type of on-site wastewater management system is required at the building application stage. Approval of a specific system will be subject to a site assessment by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. It is recommended that the applicant contact the Council's Environmental Health Officer prior to commencement of site or road works to ensure an adequate area remains for installation of a wastewater system.</p> <p>2 The on-site wastewater management system for the proposed dwelling being installed in accordance with the <i>Australian/New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 1547:2000 - Onsite Domestic Wastewater Management</i>.</p>
	<p>In addition the applicants are requested to note:</p> <p>A In regard to condition (1) - The property appears suitable for the installation of a septic tank or aerated wastewater system subject to a minimum area of suitable land being dedicated to the on-site disposal of sullage and sewage effluent.</p>
<p>Engineering Services                  . Environmental Engineer</p>	<p>The developer shall:</p> <p>1 provide a sealed vehicular access generally in accordance with the Council's Standard Drawing SD-1009 Rural Roads - Typical Standard Access (copy to be enclosed) to the satisfaction of the Council's Director Engineering Services;</p>

	<p>2 undertake any works necessary such that the vehicular access complies with the Safe Intersection Sight Distance Table S1.6.2 of the Central Coast Planning Scheme 2005, to the satisfaction of the Council's Director Engineering Services. Refer to Standard Drawing SD-1012 Intersection and Domestic Access Sight Distance Requirements (copy to be enclosed); and</p> <p>3 rectify any damage or disturbance to roads, noting that this work will be done by the Council at the owner's/developer's expense and to the satisfaction of Council's Director Engineering Services, unless alternative arrangements are approved by the Council.</p> <p>Developer to note:</p> <p>A The "works necessary such that the vehicular access complies with the Safe Intersection Sight Distance Table" will involve the realignment of a short section of the front fence on northern side of the access. The extent of this work should be discussed with the Council's Engineering Services Department.</p> <p>B Any works undertaken within the road reservation requires a Road Reserve Permit to be issued prior to the commencement of construction. An application form can be obtained from the Engineering Services Department. A fee applies.</p> <p>C Any works associated with existing roads will be undertaken by the Council at the owner's/developer's cost, unless alternative arrangements are approved by the Council.</p>
--	---

*CONSULTATION*

The application was notified for a 14-day statutory period as required under s.57 of the *Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993*. Notification involved a notice placed on the site, an advertisement in The Advocate newspaper, and letters to adjoining property owners.

One representation was received, from the neighbour at 154 Isandula Road. The objection is contained in Annexure 3 but is summarized and responded to as follows:

<i>COMMENT</i>	<i>RESPONSE</i>
<p>1 Clause 15.4.3 of the Planning Scheme requires that a dwelling must not fetter an agricultural use on another lot.</p> <p>The objector’s land is used for agricultural purposes involving cutting of hay, cattle feeding and use of pesticides. The proposed house would restrict pesticide use and affect cattle breeding.</p>	<p>The point is a fair one in a general sense, however the objectors are themselves on a small lot also close to agricultural land and uses.</p> <p>Their dwelling could be said to potentially fetter other agricultural uses on neighbouring land. Also, any use of pesticides through spraying are required to be undertaken in accordance with a code of conduct to avoid nuisances being created. Protective measures would presumably be taken to ensure that pesticide use on their property did not adversely affect their own dwelling. Such precautions would likely also be sufficient to ensure that a nuisance was not caused to the proposed dwelling.</p>
<p>2 Acceptable Solution A3 requires a dwelling unit to be on a lot of at least 50ha – the proposal fails to meet the standard.</p>	<p>This is true; however the Planning Scheme uses the tests contained in the Performance Criteria to assess whether an exercise of discretion on the AS is justified.</p>



<p>3 The Performance criteria require that the dwelling is built after all buildings associated with the use are approved and established. Such buildings and infrastructure are not yet constructed.</p>	<p>This is true. Any approval by the Council should be conditional that the required buildings and infrastructure associated with the Resource Development use are approved and established prior to construction of the dwelling.</p>
<p>4 Noise associated with use of machinery on the objector's property may cause a nuisance to occupants of the proposed dwelling if built so close. An attenuation zone may be required.</p>	<p>The objectors have their house on a small lot which is close to agricultural land and uses. Their house could potentially fetter other agricultural uses on neighbouring land. Also, any noise generated by the objectors would affect surrounding houses and occupants of their own. Consequently it is unlikely that noise is likely to be a significant issue.</p>
<p>5 Vehicle access to Isandula Road from the objector's property may have sight lines obstructed by a dwelling, sign or garden on the subject land.</p>	<p>Obstruction of sightlines to Isandula Road would not occur with the proposed development - it would be sited well back from the property frontage and access points. The Planning Scheme would control the future siting of any additional structures.</p>

*IMPACT ON RESOURCES*

The proposal has no likely impact on Council resources outside those usually required for assessment and reporting, and possibly costs associated with an appeal against the Council's determination should one be instituted by the applicants.

*CORPORATE COMPLIANCE*

The recommendation is consistent with the Central Coast Strategic Plan 2009-2014 in relation to the following strategies and key actions:

The Shape of the Place

- Adopt an integrated approach to land use planning

A Connected Central Coast

- Connect the people with services

Community Capacity and Creativity

- Facilitate entrepreneurship in the business community

The Environment and Sustainable Infrastructure

- Develop and manage sustainable built infrastructure

*CONCLUSION*

The subject property and surrounding area is zoned Rural Resource, the purpose of which is to ensure that:

- (a) the agricultural potential of agricultural land is protected;
- (b) the productive capacity of agricultural land and mining is given priority;
- (c) houses and other non-agricultural use or development do not alienate agricultural land;
- (d) the fragmentation of rural holdings is prevented;
- (e) .....
- (f) .....

The surrounding area shows some signs of pressure for conversion to “rural residential” purposes. The clear intention of the Planning Scheme is to protect agricultural land for legitimate agricultural activity, without the constraints that unrelated residential development are likely to bring.

The applicants’ contention that they will be able to run a viable cattle operation on the land is open to serious question, based on Council’s agricultural consultant’s review of the proposed business plan.

Consequently, the application must be considered to fail to demonstrate that it would be a viable agricultural operation. Having failed this test it follows that it would also fail the test of being considered an integral and subservient to a Resource development use under 15.2 Table of Use. The proposal’s more appropriate use classification is Residential. An assessment under the relevant provisions of the Planning Scheme for a residential use has been previously conducted: it was assessed as not meeting key requirements of the Scheme.

The second point requires that the dwelling is not sited on prime agricultural land. The advice of the agronomist that the land is Class 4 land is based on a map that is not suitable for the purposes of determining land classification on particular lots. It may be correct but a site specific assessment is required in order to make a reliable assessment and adequately informed decision. The proposal cannot be regarded as satisfying clause 15.4.3 Protection of Agricultural Land P3 (b).

In its current form the proposed development could result in fettering, in two respects. First, the location of the shed for cattle rearing is too close to the neighbouring house (noise and smell concerns) and second, is that possible activities like intensive horticulture or cropping could be restricted in future. The proposal cannot be regarded as satisfying clause 15.4.3 Protection of Agricultural Land P3 (c).

Clause 15.4.3 Protection of Agricultural Land P3 (d) requires that required buildings and infrastructure must be approved or established prior to construction of the dwelling. This has not yet occurred, though it could be required as a condition.

The proposal fails key tests under the provisions of section 15.4.3 Protection of Agricultural Land, P3, of the Planning Scheme, as follows:

- . It has not adequately demonstrated that it would be a viable agricultural operation, worthy of the Resource development use status.
- . The proposed dwelling cannot be considered integral and subservient.
- . It has not been adequately demonstrated that the dwelling would not be on prime agricultural land.
- . The proposed dwelling and shed have the potential to cause fettering and be fettered by nearby dwellings.

It is recommended that the application for a Residential dwelling and outbuilding at CT 147536/1 Lot 1, Isandula Road, Gawler, be refused on the following grounds:

- 1 It does not demonstrate that the operation is a viable agricultural use and therein does not constitute a Resource development use under section 15.2 Table of Use of the Central Coast Planning Scheme;

- 2 The proposed dwelling cannot be regarded as being integral and subservient to a Resource development use under section 15.2 Table of Use;
- 3 It does not satisfy Performance Criteria P3 (a) of section 15.4.3 Protection of Agricultural Land of the Planning Scheme in that the dwelling unit would not be integral and subservient to a legitimate animal breeding operation; and
- 4 It does not satisfy Performance Criteria P3 (c) of section 15.4.3 Protection of Agricultural Land of the Planning Scheme in that the development is likely to cause fettering of surrounding agricultural uses and be fettered by the presence of nearby dwellings.'

The Land Use Planning Group Leader's report is supported."

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

"Copies of the Annexures referred to in the Land Use Planning Group Leader's report have been circulated to all Councillors."

■ Cr van Rooyen moved and Cr Deacon seconded, "That neither the representation nor the variation to the Protection of Agricultural Land Planning Scheme Acceptable Solution are deemed to have merit in this application to warrant refusal and that Application No. DA210027 be approved for a Resource development use with integral and subservient dwelling and outbuilding, subject to the following conditions and notes:

#### General

- 1 The development must be in accordance with the plans and information submitted as part of the application for this permit, unless modified by a condition of this permit;
- 2 Buildings and infrastructure associated with the approved animal breeding use must be established prior to the construction of the dwelling;
- 3 Liquid pollutants must not be discharged:
  - (a) within 100m of a watercourse, wetland or other surface waters;
  - (b) within 250m of any bore or well which is the source of drinking water for humans or stock;
  - (c) within 40m of any private waters in other ownership; or

- (d) into the ground at any place or in a manner that may contaminate groundwater resources;
- 4 A wetland or watercourse must not be filled, drained or adversely affected;
- 5 The natural flow of water into or out of a wetland or watercourse must not be adversely affected;
- 6 A wetland or watercourse must not be adversely affected by increased erosion or sedimentation;
- 7 Native vegetation must not be removed or destroyed within 30m of the bank of a wetland or watercourse other than in accordance with the Forest Practices Code 2000;

#### Engineering

The developer shall:

- 8 provide a sealed vehicular access generally in accordance with the Council's Standard Drawing SD-1009 Rural Roads – Typical Standard Access (copy to be enclosed) to the satisfaction of the Council's Director Engineering Services;
- 9 undertake any works necessary such that the vehicular access complies with the Safe Intersection Sight Distance Table S1.6.2 of the Central Coast Planning Scheme 2005, to the satisfaction of the Council's Director Engineering Services. Refer to Standard Drawing SD-1012 Intersection and Domestic Access Sight Distance Requirements (copy to be enclosed);
- 10 rectify any damage or disturbance to roads, noting that this work will be done by the Council at the owner's/developer's expense and to the satisfaction of Council's Director Engineering Services, unless alternative arrangements are approved by the Council;

#### Environment & Health

- 11 A separate application detailing the design and type of on-site wastewater management system is required at the building application stage. Approval of a specific system will be subject to a site assessment by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. It is recommended that the applicant contact the Council's Environmental Health Officer prior to commencement of site or road works to ensure an adequate area remains for installation of a wastewater system; and

- 12 The on-site wastewater management system for the proposed dwelling being installed in accordance with the Australian/New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 1547:2000 – Onsite Domestic Wastewater Management.

In addition the applicants are requested to note:

- A The ‘works necessary such that the vehicular access complies with the Safe Intersection Sight Distance Table’ will involve the realignment of a short section of the front fence on northern side of the access. The extent of this work should be discussed with the Council’s Engineering Services Department.
- B Any works undertaken within the road reservation requires a Road Reserve Permit to be issued prior to the commencement of construction. An application form can be obtained from the Engineering Services Department. A fee applies.
- C Any works associated with existing roads will be undertaken by the Council at the owner’s/developer’s cost, unless alternative arrangements are approved by the Council.
- D In regard to condition (11) – The property appears suitable for the installation of a septic tank or aerated wastewater system subject to a minimum area of suitable land being dedicated to the on-site disposal of sillage and sewage effluent.
- E Building and plumbing permits are required for both the dwelling and outbuilding.”

The Acting Mayor advised as follows:

“I will adjourn the meeting for 10 minutes to allow Councillors time to read a circulated document providing reasons in support of the motion now before the meeting.”

On resumption of the meeting the motion was debated.

Continued after Minute No. 262/2010.

#### **262/2010 Public question time**

The time being 6.43pm, the Acting Mayor introduced public question time.

There were no questions from the public.

#### **Minute No. 261/2010 continued...**

Motion

Carried unanimously

GENERAL MANAGEMENT

**263/2010 Minutes and notes of committees of the Council and other organisations**

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“The following (non-confidential) minutes and notes of committees of the Council and other organisations on which the Council has representation have been received:

- . Barrington Fire Management Area Committee – meeting held on 12 May 2010
- . Cradle Coast Authority – Representatives meeting held on 27 May 2010
- . Ulverstone Local History Museum Committee – meetings held on 17 June and 8 July 2010
- . East Ulverstone Swimming Pool Management Committee – meeting held on 15 July 2010
- . Youth Engaged Steering Committee – meeting held on 15 July 2010
- . Penguin Miniature Railway Management Committee – meeting held on 27 July 2010.

Copies of the minutes and notes have been circulated to all Councillors.”

- Cr Deacon moved and Cr Haines seconded, “That the (non-confidential) minutes and notes of committees of the Council be received.”

Carried unanimously

CORPORATE & COMMUNITY SERVICES

**264/2010 Contracts and agreements**

The Director Corporate & Community Services reported as follows:

“A Schedule of Contracts and Agreements (other than those approved under the common seal) entered into during the month of July 2010 has been submitted by the General Manager to the Council for information. The information is reported in accordance with approved delegations and responsibilities.”

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“A copy of the Schedule has been circulated to all Councillors.”

- Cr Deacon moved and Cr Viney seconded, “That the Schedule of Contracts and Agreements (a copy being appended to and forming part of the minutes) be received.”

Carried unanimously

**265/2010 Common seal**

The Director Corporate & Community Services reported as follows:

“A Schedule of Documents for Affixing of the Common Seal for the period 20 July to 16 August 2010 is submitted. Use of the common seal must first be authorised by a resolution of the Council. There are no documents listed for which authority of the Council to seal is required to be given at this meeting.

The Schedule also includes for information advice of final plans of subdivision sealed in accordance with approved delegation and responsibilities.”

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“A copy of the Schedule has been circulated to all Councillors.”

- Cr Deacon moved and Cr Howard seconded, “That (a copy of the Schedule of Documents for Affixing of the Common Seal being appended to and forming part of the minutes) the advice of final plans of subdivision sealed in accordance with approved delegation and responsibilities be received.”

Carried unanimously



**266/2010 Financial statements**

The Director Corporate & Community Services reported as follows:

“The following principal financial statements of the Council for the period ended 31 July 2010 are submitted for consideration:

- . Summary of Rates and Fire Service Levies
- . Operating and Capital Statement
- . Cashflow Statement
- . Capital Works Resource Schedule.”

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“Copies of the financial statements have been circulated to all Councillors.”

- Cr Fuller moved and Cr Deacon seconded, “That the financial statements (copies being appended to and forming part of the minutes) be received.”

Carried unanimously

**267/2010 Rate remissions**

The Director Corporate & Community Services reported as follows:

“The following rate remissions are proposed for the Council’s consideration:

<i>PROPERTY NO.</i>	101130.0120
<i>PROPERTY ADDRESS</i>	40 Maskells Road, Ulverstone
<i>REMISSION</i>	\$ 456.23
<i>REASON</i>	Remit 50% of General Rate for Club.

<i>PROPERTY NO.</i>	302330.0260
<i>PROPERTY ADDRESS</i>	Braddons Lookout Road, Leith
<i>REMISSION</i>	\$172.49
<i>REASON</i>	Property is deemed to be valueless, General Rate was previously charged using AAV and not minimum amount.

<i>PROPERTY NO.</i>	403560.0220
<i>PROPERTY ADDRESS</i>	25 Sice Avenue, Heybridge
<i>REMISSION</i>	\$144.00
<i>REASON</i>	Property is vacant land and should not have been charged a Waste Management Charge.

<i>PROPERTY NO.</i>	504870.0380
<i>PROPERTY ADDRESS</i>	611 Ironcliffe Road, Penguin
<i>REMISSION</i>	\$827.94
<i>REASON</i>	Property is a State reserve and is non-rateable."

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

"The *Local Government Act 1993* provides that a council, by absolute majority, may grant a remission of all or part of any rates."

■ Cr Haines moved and Cr Viney seconded, "That the following remissions be approved:

- . Property No. 101130.0120 – \$456.23
- . Property No. 302330.0260 – \$172.49
- . Property No. 403560.0220 – \$144.00
- . Property No. 504870.0380 – \$827.94."

Carried unanimously and by absolute majority

#### **268/2010 Waiving of Central Coast Resource Recovery Centre access fees – City Mission**

The Director Corporate & Community Services reported as follows:

*"PURPOSE*

To consider a contribution towards the Central Coast Resource Recovery Centre fees for access by the City Mission.

*BACKGROUND*

The City Mission (the Mission) has written asking the Council to consider some form of concession in regard to the fees paid by the Mission to access the Resource Recovery Centre to dispose of unsellable items from their facility in Fieldings Way, Ulverstone.

*DISCUSSION*

The Mission operates from a property in Ulverstone at 9 Fieldings Way. The Ulverstone property pays a General Rate and relevant service charges but does not pay a Waste Management Charge as a household garbage collection service is not available to commercial operations. The majority of properties occupied by charitable organisations do not pay a General Rate.

Currently most users of the Resource Recovery Centre are required to pay for any rubbish deposited at the site. There have, however, been three exemptions considered to date; for Lifeline (Minute No. 65/2006 – 20.02.2006 where the Council agreed to make an annual contribution of \$156.00), for the Salvation Army Thrift Shop (Minute No. 110/2007 – 19.03.2007 where the Council agreed to a 50% rebate of costs) and for the St Vincent de Paul Society (Minute No. 61/2009 – 16.02.2009 where the Council agreed to make an annual contribution of \$312.00). Two of these three properties (Lifeline and St Vincent de Paul) also pay the General Rate.

If the Council wishes to make a contribution towards the service that the Mission provides to this community then this could be achieved through a reduction in the site access fees.

According to the Mission it is anticipated that they would regularly need to make two trips a month to the Resource Recovery Centre. The Council could choose to make an annual contribution amounting to \$96.00 towards their costs. This amounts to 50% of their annual costs (based on current fee levels and the use of a van for rubbish removal).

*CONSULTATION*

This item has no effect in relation to consultation.

*IMPACT ON RESOURCES*

The impact of this decision would amount to a reduction in revenue of \$96.00 per annum.

*CORPORATE COMPLIANCE*

The Central Coast Strategic Plan 2009–2014 includes the following strategies and key actions:

A Connected Central Coast

- Improve community wellbeing

*CONCLUSION*

It is recommended that the Council make an annual contribution amounting to \$96.00 towards the cost of the City Mission's access to the Central Coast Resource Recovery Centre, providing that the property from which the Mission operates continues to attract a General Rate."

- Cr van Rooyen moved and Cr Fuller seconded, "That the Council make an annual contribution amounting to \$96.00 towards the cost of the City Mission's access to the Central Coast Resource Recovery Centre, providing that the property from which the Society operates continues to attract a General Rate."

Carried unanimously

### **269/2010 Application for lease of Penguin Railway Station**

*Cr Fuller, having declared an interest, retired from the meeting and left the Chamber for that part of the meeting relating to the consideration, discussion and voting on the matter of an application to lease the Penguin Railway Station Meeting Rooms.*

The Director Corporate & Community Services reported as follows:

#### *PURPOSE*

The purpose of this report is to consider an application for the lease of the Penguin Railway Station Meeting Rooms at 44 Main Road, Penguin, for the purpose of a Pancake Parlour on weekends.

#### *BACKGROUND*

The Council has received a request from Mrs Cheryl Fuller that would involve the use of the Penguin Railway Station Meeting Rooms located at 44 Main Road, Penguin, as a Pancake Parlour on Saturdays and Sundays with a proposed commencement in October 2010.

The Penguin Railway Station is not public land and the Council is able to lease the property.

#### *DISCUSSION*

Mrs Fuller wishes to submit a planning application involving the use of the Penguin Railway Station as a Pancake Parlour. Such an application is a discretionary use for this property under the Central Coast Planning Scheme 2005 and would also require the reclassification of the building from a Class 9b building to a Class 6 building in order for it to be used in the manner proposed. A private building surveyor would need to be engaged by the applicant to issue an Occupancy Certificate and an updated Schedule of Essential Maintenance. If structural work is proposed then a building application may be required. The building would also have to be registered as a food business under the *Food Act 2003*; however the kitchen is considered to be suitable for the proposed activity.

The proposal is one that would enhance the popularity of Penguin as a weekend visitor location and would both complement and compete with a number of premises providing various eating options. The Council would need to ensure that a commercial rental is obtained for any such lease for the purpose of transparency and commercial probity.

The future of the Penguin Railway Station is likely to be a critical element in the consideration of the Penguin Cultural Precinct Plan and any decision to lease the property would need to be of a short-term nature until the outcomes of the Penguin Cultural Plan are clearly identified. With the State Government resuming ownership of the rail system the possibility of weekend or tourist train services as were previously run from Burnie, or alternatively a service run by the Don River Railway, is also a possibility during the summer months. Any use of the Penguin Railway Station would also need to be compatible with the introduction of such services.

A number of bookings for either Saturday and/or Sunday have already been received and registered for the use of the Penguin Railway Station Meeting Rooms during the forthcoming months of October, November, December and January. Any lease of the building for weekends would impact on the availability of the building for future bookings and would need to take into account existing bookings.

#### *CONSULTATION*

The report outlines the level of consultation undertaken as per the requirement under the *Local Government Act 1993*.

#### *IMPACT ON RESOURCES*

Some costs would be incurred in obtaining a commercial rental figure from a registered valuer. It is anticipated that this would be in the order of \$400. Any planning or building survey costs would be met by the applicant.

#### *CORPORATE COMPLIANCE*

The Central Coast Strategic Plan 2009–2014 includes the following strategies and key actions:

##### The Shape of the Place

- Encourage a creative approach to new development

##### Council Sustainability and Governance

- Improve the Council's financial capacity to sustainably meet community expectations

*CONCLUSION*

It is recommended that, in respect of the request received from Mrs Fuller relating to the lease of the Penguin Railway Station Meeting Rooms, the General Manager be authorised to proceed to the lease of the Meeting Rooms to Mrs Fuller (subject to any necessary planning approvals also being granted), subject to the lessee:

- 1 agreeing to pay a commercial rental as set by a registered valuer;
- 2 agreeing to a lease for a period of five months commencing in November 2010, including every weekend apart from those times where the Railway Station has already been booked; and
- 3 undertaking to cover all costs associated with enabling the Meeting Rooms and Kitchen to be used for the purpose of a Pancake Parlour.”

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“A copy of correspondence received from Mrs Fuller has been circulated to all Councillors.”

■ Cr van Rooyen moved and Cr Howard seconded, “That, in respect of the request received from Mrs Cheryl Fuller relating to the lease of the Penguin Railway Station Meeting Rooms at 44 Main Road, Penguin, the General Manager be authorised to proceed to the lease of the Meeting Rooms to Mrs Fuller (subject to any necessary planning approvals also being granted), subject to the lessee:

- 1 agreeing to pay a commercial rental as set by a registered valuer;
- 2 agreeing to a lease for a period of five months commencing in November 2010, including every weekend apart from those times where the Railway Station has already been booked; and
- 3 undertaking to cover all costs associated with enabling the Meeting Rooms and Kitchen to be used for the purpose of a Pancake Parlour.”

Carried unanimously

ENGINEERING SERVICES

**270/2010 Engineering Services determinations**

The Director Engineering Services reported as follows:

“A Schedule of Engineering Services Determinations made during the month of July 2010 is submitted to the Council for information. The information is reported in accordance with approved delegations and responsibilities.”

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“A copy of the Schedule has been circulated to all Councillors.”

■ Cr Deacon moved and Cr van Rooyen seconded, “That the Schedule of Engineering Services Determinations (a copy being appended to and forming part of the minutes) be received.”

Carried unanimously

**271/2010 Unsealed Roads Policy**

The Director Engineering Services reported as follows:

*PURPOSE*

This report considers the introduction of an Unsealed Roads Policy and Guidelines. The Policy and Guidelines are shown in the appended annexure.

*BACKGROUND*

Previous Estimates over a number of years have highlighted the need for a Rural Roads Strategy. The Estimates of 2007–2008 commentary reads as follows:

‘Rural Roads strategy – Development of a sustainable rural roads strategy is very dependent on the course taken with unsealed roads.

The length of unsealed roads (138km) is only a quarter of the rural road network or 20% of the total road network. This compares favourably with the State proportion of 55% for local government roads and the national proportion of 65% for the total length of unsealed roads.

The warrant for sealed roads in the remaining areas needs to be questioned in view of the agricultural uses of the municipal area. Requests are still being received for gravel roads to be sealed, the most recent being Harveys Road, Bienefelts Road and Wynwoods Road. The issues raised include safety and dust.

Some other factors that may influence the argument to seal roads in the future are the following:

- . New residences being constructed on titles that have been vacant in the rural areas for a number of years.
- . Expectation of residents living on gravel roads.
- . Use of unsealed roads by tourists, noting that many hire cars are not supposed to use unsealed roads.
- . Contribution from property owners.
- . Gravel length is greater than 2km.
- . Number of residences serviced is more than five.

It is realised that the political factor is another consideration, but it needs to be recognised that the “end of the road” is near in respect to sealing certain gravel roads, and efforts need to be put into maintaining the total road network for the long term in a programmed and sustainable manner. This may mean that a proportion of roads are never sealed in the future.

It is suggested that an economic analysis be undertaken on the effect of sealing certain unsealed roads based on the above criteria. This would allow the effect on reseal and maintenance grading costs to be considered further and provide supportive information to allow the Council to develop a sustainable rural roads strategy into the future.’

The adoption of an Unsealed Roads Policy and Guidelines is now timely in view of the development of long-term asset management and sustainable financial plans.

The Engineering Group Leader reported as follows:

‘The Council has an obligation to maintain the total road network long term. Due to the nature of the roads and the initial and ongoing costs involved most unsealed roads will never be sealed.

The Council receives periodic complaints about its unsealed road network. They are most common during the summer months and include:

- . surface conditions such as corrugates and roughness where the users feel the roads are unsafe or their cars will sustain damage.



- . dusty conditions where houses are left dusty inside and out, water tanks are contaminated, yards are dusty, washing is dirty, and health issues such as for those with breathing problems.

An additional concern for the Council is the loss of gravel, as is the regular maintenance required to keep the roads at an acceptable standard.

Generally these complaints result in a request for the unsealed road to be sealed. Adoption of an Unsealed Road Policy and Guidelines will ensure a systematic method of assessing these requests is utilised. It will enable the sealing or otherwise of unsealed rural roads to be prioritised using a measurable and transparent assessment framework.

This is an important factor in the ongoing sustainability of both the unsealed and sealed road network.

#### *DISCUSSION*

The total length of the Council's road network is 662km, valued at \$135 million. The current length of unsealed roads is 126km (20%) valued at \$9 million. The average maintenance cost for rural sealed roads (including cost of reseals, construction and life-cycle costs) is \$5,300/km and for rural unsealed roads is \$2,400/km. There is currently a service gap (backlog) of reseals of approximately \$2.5 million. The cost to upgrade and seal a gravel road is in the order of \$250,000/km.

A survey of all gravel roads was undertaken by Council staff in 2005. Information on approximate traffic volumes, road safety, drainage, pavement condition, total number of residents, number affected by dust, signage, maintenance issues, strategic significance, and reconstruction constraints were recorded.

In order to ensure transparency and for the results to stand up to public scrutiny a method to score and prioritise the roads has been developed and all roads assessed by the Road Asset Management Team. A minimum score for inclusion/consideration on a sealing programme also needs to be adopted.

The following table represents the costs involved with the highest rating roads from the assessments conducted by the Road Asset Management Team.

<i>ROAD</i>	<i>SCORE</i>	<i>LENGTH (M)</i>	<i>CAPITAL COST</i>	<i>ADDITIONAL ANNUAL RESEAL/MAINTENANCE</i>
Bienefelts Road	206	730	\$182k	\$2,120
Haywoods Road	146	800	\$200k	\$2,320
Harveys Road	139	1840	\$460k	\$5,335
Smiths Plains Road	128	1000	\$250k	\$2,900
Purtons Road	119	1250	\$312k	\$3,625
Loongana Road	115	4500	\$1,125k	\$13,050
Dial Road	101	2600	\$650k	\$7,540
<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>12.7km</i>	<i>\$3.2m</i>	<i>\$36,890</i>

This level of additional expenditure on rural roads is considered unsustainable.

Based on the method contained in the Unsealed Road Guidelines only those roads scoring above 150 would be considered.

A score of 150 was adopted, based on the analysis, experience and sustainability considerations, noting that there is the opportunity for re-assessment and special circumstances in the Guidelines.

The criteria used for the assessment are weighted and include traffic volumes, strategic significance, maintenance considerations, safety considerations, number of residences, distance of residences from the road, type of water supply and owner/occupier concerns.

During 2008/09 trials for dust suppression products were conducted on several roads. These trials proved to be unsuccessful. As a result it is recommended that sealing is the only means of dust suppression to be utilised in the future and only when the Guideline criteria are met. This is supported by a quotation from the Australian Roads Research Board (ARRB) Group – Unsealed Roads manual which states:

“Short of sealing a road, there are no known ways to eliminate dust emissions effectively on a long-term basis by using a single process or just one application of a dust suppressant.”

The only instance when sealing of a section of road not meeting the criteria will be considered is when there are business or serious consequences associated with not sealing that section. Examples of this would include a dairy next to a gravel road where the dust might contaminate the milk supply, or where a requirement is placed on an agricultural business by a head contract that might not allow its produce to be sold if not compliant, e.g. supply of fruit or other above-ground crop.

It is recommended the sealing in these instances will need to be treated individually on merit. Options for sealing are detailed in the Unsealed Road Guidelines and include full cost by Council, full cost by applicant or 50% cost basis. Sealing for a length of 200m without widening or upgrade would cost approximately \$20,000. Narrow sealed sections are also difficult to maintain and have historically shown signs of deterioration at a faster rate than wider roads.

#### *CONSULTATION*

A workshop with Councillors was conducted on 31 May 2010 to present the contents of the Policy and information behind the Guidelines.

#### *IMPACT ON RESOURCES*

This item may impact future capital works budgets and ongoing road maintenance budgets. Sealing for a length of 200m without widening or upgrade would cost approximately \$20,000. Even a small increase of 200m to the sealed road network has an ongoing effect as it adds a further \$580 per year based on full life-cycle costs.

Bienefelts Road is listed for sealing in the estimates for 2011–2013 at an estimated cost of \$180,000.

#### *CORPORATE COMPLIANCE*

The Central Coast Strategic Plan 2009–2014 includes the following strategies and key actions:

##### A Connected Central Coast

- . Provide for a diverse range of movement patterns
- . Connect the people with services

The Environment and Sustainable Infrastructure

- Develop and manage sustainable built infrastructure

Council Sustainability and Governance

- Improve the Council's financial capacity to sustainably meet community expectations

*CONCLUSION*

It is recommended that the Unsealed Roads Policy with supporting Guidelines be adopted.'

The Engineering Group Leader's report is supported."

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

"Copies of the Unsealed Roads Policy and Guidelines – August 2010 have been circulated to all Councillors."

- Cr Fuller moved and Cr Haines seconded, "That the Unsealed Roads Policy with supporting Guidelines – August 2010 be adopted."

Voting for the motion

(8)

Cr (J) Bonde

Cr Deacon

Cr Dry

Cr Fuller

Cr Haines

Cr Howard

Cr van Rooyen

Cr Viney

Voting against the motion

(1)

Cr (L) Bonde

Motion

Carried

**272/2010 Opening of various streets/roads**

The Director Engineering Services reported as follows:

"It is necessary to formally resolve that the Council intends to 'open', after the expiration of 28 days, the following streets/roads which have been constructed in new subdivisions:

- . Berkshire Parade, Penguin;
- . Explorer Drive (in part), Turners Beach;
- . Julies Court, Turners Beach;
- . Chamberlain Street (extension), Ulverstone;
- . Jesamel Place, Ulverstone;
- . Cornelia Street (extension), Ulverstone; and
- . Unnamed street (off Preservation Drive), Preservation Bay.”

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“Plans of Berkshire Parade, Penguin; Explorer Drive, Turners Beach; Julies Court, Turners Beach; Chamberlain Street, Ulverstone; Jesamel Place, Ulverstone; Cornelia Street, Ulverstone and unnamed street, Preservation Bay, have been circulated to all Councillors.”

■ Cr van Rooyen moved and Cr (L) Bonde seconded, “That, having given notice in accordance with the *Local Government (Highways) Act 1982*, the Council open as a highway Berkshire Parade, Penguin; Explorer Drive, Turners Beach; Julies Court, Turners Beach; Chamberlain Street, Ulverstone; Jesamel Place, Ulverstone; Cornelia Street, Ulverstone and unnamed street, Preservation Bay (plans of the streets/roads being appended to and forming part of the minutes).”

Carried unanimously

**273/2010 Various streets/roads – Certificate of completion**

The Director Engineering Services reported as follows:

“It is necessary for the Council to certify that the following streets/roads have been constructed substantially in accordance with the plans and specifications approved by the Council:

- . Berkshire Parade, Penguin;
- . Explorer Drive (in part), Turners Beach;
- . Julies Court, Turners Beach;
- . Chamberlain Street (extension), Ulverstone;
- . Jesamel Place, Ulverstone;
- . Cornelia Street (extension), Ulverstone; and
- . Unnamed street (off Preservation Drive), Preservation Bay.”

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“Plans of Berkshire Parade, Penguin; Explorer Drive, Turners Beach; Julies Court, Turners Beach; Chamberlain Street, Ulverstone; Jesamel Place, Ulverstone; Cornelia Street, Ulverstone and unnamed street, Preservation Bay, have been circulated to all Councillors.”

- Cr Deacon moved and Cr Howard seconded, “That, the Council certify under the hand of the Corporation’s engineer that Berkshire Parade, Penguin; Explorer Drive, Turners Beach; Julies Court, Turners Beach; Chamberlain Street, Ulverstone; Jesamel Place, Ulverstone; Cornelia Street, Ulverstone and unnamed street, Preservation Bay (plans of the streets/roads being appended to and forming part of the minutes) have been constructed substantially in accordance with the plans and specifications approved by the Council.”

Carried unanimously

---

## CLOSURE OF MEETING TO THE PUBLIC

### 274/2010 Meeting closed to the public

The Executive Services Officer reported as follows:

“The *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005* provide that a meeting of a council is to be open to the public unless the council, by absolute majority, decides to close the meeting or part of the meeting because it wishes to discuss a matter (or matters) in a closed meeting and the Regulations provide accordingly.

Moving into a closed meeting is to be by procedural motion. Once a meeting is closed, meeting procedures are not relaxed unless the council so decides.

It is considered desirable that the following matter be discussed in a closed meeting:

- Minutes and notes of other organisations and committees of the Council.

This is a matter relating to:

- information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential.”

■ Cr Deacon moved and Cr Viney seconded, “That the Council close the meeting to the public to consider the following matter, it being a matter relating to:

- information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential;

and the Council being of the opinion that it is lawful and proper to close the meeting to the public:

- Minutes and notes of other organisations and committees of the Council.”

Carried unanimously and by absolute majority

The Executive Services Officer further reported as follows:

“1 The *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005* provide in respect of any matter discussed at a closed meeting that the general manager is to record in the minutes of the open meeting, in a manner that protects confidentiality, only the fact that the matter was discussed and is not to record in the minutes of the open meeting the details of the outcome unless the council determines otherwise.

- 
- 2 The *Local Government Act 1993* provides that a councillor must not disclose information seen or heard at a meeting or part of a meeting that is closed to the public that is not authorised by the council to be disclosed.

Similarly, an employee of a council must not disclose information acquired as such an employee on the condition that it be kept confidential.

- 3 In the event that additional business is required to be conducted by a council after the matter(s) for which the meeting has been closed to the public have been conducted, the Regulations provide that a council may, by simple majority, re-open a closed meeting to the public.”



GENERAL MANAGEMENT

**275/2010 Minutes and notes of other organisations and committees of the Council**

The Executive Services Officer reported (reproduced in part) as follows:

“The following minutes and notes of committees of the Council and other organisations on which the Council has representation have been received:

...

The *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005* provide in respect of any matter discussed at a closed meeting that ‘the general manager -

- (a) is to record in the minutes of the open meeting, in a manner that protects confidentiality, only the fact that the matter was discussed; and
- (b) is not to record in the minutes of the open meeting the details of the outcome unless the council or council committee determines otherwise.’

The details of this matter are accordingly to be recorded in the minutes of the closed part of the meeting.”

---

## **Closure**

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 8.00pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 20TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2010.

## **Chairperson**

(gjm:dil)

## **Appendices**

- Minute No. 258/2010 – Schedule of Development & Regulatory Services Determinations
- Minute No. 264/2010 – Schedule of Contracts & Agreements
- Minute No. 265/2010 – Schedule of Documents for Affixing of the Common Seal
- Minute No. 266/2010 – Financial statements
- Minute No. 270/2010 – Schedule of Engineering Services Determinations
- Minute Nos 272 & 273/2010 – Plans of streets/roads

---

## QUALIFIED PERSON'S ADVICE

The *Local Government Act 1993* provides (in part) as follows:

- . A general manager must ensure that any advice, information or recommendation given to the council is given by a person who has the qualifications or experience necessary to give such advice, information or recommendation.
- . A council is not to decide on any matter which requires the advice of a qualified person without considering such advice unless the general manager certifies in writing that such advice was obtained and taken into account in providing general advice to the council.

I therefore certify that with respect to all advice, information or recommendation provided to the Council within these minutes:

- (i) the advice, information or recommendation was given by a person who has the qualifications or experience necessary to give such advice, information or recommendation; and
- (ii) where any advice was directly given by a person who did not have the required qualifications or experience that person has obtained and taken into account in that person's general advice the advice from an appropriately qualified or experienced person.

Sandra Ayton  
GENERAL MANAGER