

Elyse Kenny

From: Martha Dotter <Martha.Dotter@rfs.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 28 April 2022 11:32 AM
To: Carlo Di Giulio
Cc: Darren Marks
Subject: FW: Kalkite - Summary of meeting

Hi Carlo
Please see additional comments from District below regarding future brigade station needs.
Thanks
Martha

From: Darren Marks <Darren.Marks@rfs.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 28 April 2022 11:09 AM
To: Martha Dotter <Martha.Dotter@rfs.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: RE: Kalkite - Summary of meeting

Hi Martha
Thanks for that.

Just in regards to the station, in the short term, it would only have a Cat 7 OR and Cat 1 – not both.

Everything else looks good.

Thanks
Darren

From: Martha Dotter <Martha.Dotter@rfs.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 28 April 2022 10:46 AM
To: Darren Marks <Darren.Marks@rfs.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: Rein Peet <Rein.Peet@rfs.nsw.gov.au>; Jim Darrant <Jim.Darrant@rfs.nsw.gov.au>; Michael Gray <Michael.Gray@rfs.nsw.gov.au>; Paul Simakoff-Ellims <Paul.Simakoff-Ellims@rfs.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Fwd: Kalkite - Summary of meeting

FYI only. These are the final notes and amendments from rezoning of kalkite site meeting. I'll put this in Guardian as a pre lodgement advice.

Thanks for your assistance and input Darren and Rein.

Thanks
Martha
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: abpp@bigpond.net.au
Date: 28 April 2022 at 9:42:10 am AEST
To: Martha Dotter <Martha.Dotter@rfs.nsw.gov.au>, Carlo Di Giulio <carlod@gyde.com.au>
Cc: elysek@gyde.com.au, dino@saccogroup.com.au, Susan Fox <Susan.Fox@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: RE: Kalkite - Summary of meeting

Good morning Martha, thanks for your response. The matters that you have raised are noted and have been/will be addressed, regards Graham

From: Martha Dotter <Martha.Dotter@rfs.nsw.gov.au>

Sent: Thursday, 28 April 2022 8:10 AM

To: 'Carlo Di Giulio' <carlod@gyde.com.au>

Cc: 'abpp@bigpond.net.au' <abpp@bigpond.net.au>; 'elysek@gyde.com.au'

<elysek@gyde.com.au>; 'dino@saccogroup.com.au' <dino@saccogroup.com.au>; 'Susan Fox' <Susan.Fox@planning.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: RE: Kalkite - Summary of meeting

Good afternoon

My apologies for the delay please find attached the marked up meeting notes from our pre-planning proposal discussion on the Kalkite site.

NSW RFS comments are made in red below each point – any questions or queries please contact me.

Thank you
Martha



Martha Dotter | Supervisor Development Assessment & Planning (South)
Currently working Monday, Wednesday and Friday
Planning and Environment Services
Built and Natural Environment
NSW RURAL FIRE SERVICE
Locked Bag 17 Granville NSW 2142
P 02 4472 0600 **M** 0408 459 678 **F** 02 4472 0690
E Martha.Dotter@rfs.nsw.gov.au

Antispam Service has detected a possible fraud attempt from
"www.rfs.nsw.gov.au" claiming to be www.rfs.nsw.gov.au |
www.facebook.com/nswrfs | www.twitter.com/nswrfs
PREPARE. ACT. SURVIVE.





0421 285 782 | (02) 9068 7500 | carlod@gyde.com.au
Level 6, 120 Sussex St, Sydney NSW 2000
gyde.com.au



From: Carlo Di Giulio
Sent: Friday, 8 April 2022 10:38 AM
To: Martha Dotter <Martha.Dotter@rfs.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: Graham Swain <abpp@bigpond.net.au>; Elyse Kenny <elysek@gyde.com.au>; Dino Sacco <dino@saccogroup.com.au>
Subject: RE: Kalkite - Summary of meeting

Hi Martha,

Did you have a chance to review the minutes below, and amend if required?

We're in the process of finalising concepts and the planning proposal report. As such, we'd like to ensure that we're generally on the right track.

Carlo Di Giulio
Associate Director



0421 285 782 | (02) 9068 7500 | carlod@gyde.com.au
Level 6, 120 Sussex St, Sydney NSW 2000
gyde.com.au



From: Carlo Di Giulio
Sent: Monday, 21 March 2022 4:33 PM
To: 'Martha Dotter' <Martha.Dotter@rfs.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: Graham Swain <abpp@bigpond.net.au>
Subject: Kalkite - Summary of meeting

Hi Martha,

Apologies - It's taken longer than we would have liked to get this email across to you. Everything is busy but also because Graham has injured himself recently. Apparently, he should be fine, but it has meant we haven't been able to get as much of his input into this email as we would have liked given this is his area and certainly not mine. In this case, please excuse any inaccuracies. Also, please note that this is a summary of the meeting's key details, rather than a complete minutes of the meeting.

Please make any relevant edits and forward back to us. Give me a call if necessary.

Attendees

- Martha Dotter – RFS
- Darren Marks – RFS
- Rein Peet – RFS
- Michael Grey – RFS
- Graham Swain – Australian Bushfire Protection Planners P/L
- Carlo Di Giulio – Gyde Consulting

Summary of Key items

- The proposed one road in – one road out arrangement for the subdivision raises emergency access and egress risks. It was suggested that the cul-de-sac proposed at the north eastern corner of the site could be opened into Kalkite Road to provide a secondary access point to address this issue.

It is noted the site is constrained by one road in, which traverses bush fire prone vegetation and poses potential risk of being cut off in the event of a bush fire. At strategic re-zoning stage, as part of an assessment - suitable mitigative measures should be considered to reduce and manage the level of bush fire risk to future occupants and fire fighters. This should be considered at the early stage of the planning proposal and provide options/suggestions accordingly.

In order to comply with PBP 2019, the current subdivision layout shown should provide a second point of access back onto “Hilldowns Rd”.

- The caravan park proposed in the far south eastern corner of the site may not be feasible. This is because it will most likely require extensive APZs given it immediately adjoins unmanaged Crown land. The extensive APZs may not leave sufficient land for actual camping or caravan related activities.

Special Fire Protection Purpose (SFPP) development is required to provide a 10KW APZ – the location of the caravan park (SFPP) in the south east would need to achieve APZs that demonstrate a 10KW radiant heat level - within the site (or with a suitable legal easement if relying upon land outside the subject site).

- It was noted that the vast majority of ‘Block A’ included a perimeter road. This is well received. It was noted that the proposed lots in the south eastern corner of Block A did not include a perimeter road. These lots should be provided with such a road or a fire trail.

All interface between residential development and a hazard should provide a perimeter road that complies with PBP 2019. Fire trails are not a substitute for a perimeter road. Any departure from this should be fully justified and outline how the intent of the perimeter road measures in PBP 2019 will be achieved, including management responsibilities.

- It was outlined that the proposal will include a local centre within which there would be a new fire station to serve both the proposed residents as well as existing residents in Kalkite given the existing fire station is generally inadequate. This was well received. RFS advised that the station should be designed to category 2b and include 1 x category 7 and 1 x category 1 vehicle. Ample space should be provided around the station for parking and vehicle manoeuvring.

The specifications for future emergency response agencies servicing of the development will be subject to future negotiations, including between Area Command South East RFS and the District RFS— however the identification of a block of land of sufficient size to accommodate a future brigade station is welcomed and would likely expedite future processes regarding servicing the site.

- The local centre would also include a community hall which could also serve as a shelter point in the event of an emergency. The community centre would be fully functional and include bathrooms and a kitchen. This was well received by RFS, but queries were raised in relation to who will manage the centre and who would ensure access to the centre in the event of an actual emergency.

In recognition of the isolated location of the site, the RFS supports the notion of the proposal including a safer place of refuge/community bush fire refuge that complies with the RFS NSP guidelines for radiant heat exposure and the like – The identification of this should form part of the subject planning proposal given the sites isolation. Further details would be required, as identified in the dot point above.

- A park would also form part of the local centre, which could provide additional car parking or staging area in the event of an actual emergency. This was well received by RFS.
- A risk management plan for the existing village and the proposed dwellings would be required. A key principal for the management plan shall be a requirement to 'stay and shelter in place'.
- In the past, there have been instances of embers from vegetation on the western side of Lake Jindabyne floating to the subject locality. Vegetation in the proposed subdivision will require ongoing management to minimise the change of embers resulting in bushfires and placing people and housing at risk. The proponent agreed that the volume of any new vegetation should be limited, and will require ongoing management across the entire development (i.e. Block A,B and C). In blocks B and C, the proponent advised that up to 40m APZs will be required around any new dwellings, whilst they will also be subject to vegetation management plans. Vegetation management will be required as conditions of any consent as well as restrictions on title, 88b instruments, or other similar methods.
- It was recommended that all building be constructed to Bal 12.5.

In recognition of the isolated location of the site and the constrained access, it was discussed that a suitable mitigative measure to increase the redundancy of a 'stay and shelter in place' message may be requiring the whole of the development to identify a minimum BAL 12.5. This should be via a legal instrument such as an s88B instrument or DCP etc

- Clarification is required as to whether there was sufficient space between any unmanaged land on adjoining sites and the proposed local shopping centre. Currently, it appeared as though the distance was not sufficient to offset potential heat loads from adjoining unmanaged land. The proponent advised that the separation distance will be reviewed. In the event there was not sufficient separation, the local shopping centre could be relocated to another side of the proposed round-a-bout in order to achieve the required separation.

Any place of safer refuge/community bush fire refuge identified within the development should comply with the RFS requirements for a NSP

- It was suggested that a Development Control Plan (DCP), or similar, be prepared to support any Planning Proposal.
The DCP could contain controls which minimise fire risk and require ongoing fire related site management practices.
- It was suggested that consideration should be given now, to the potential location of childcare centres, schools, and the like.

SFPP development (including childcare schools etc) require larger APZs, therefore incorporating these into the early design phase can provide for a more streamlined development assessment process at later stages.

- Overall, RFS does not raise a fundamental objection to the proposal at this stage and will provide further consideration following formal exhibition of the PP.

Subject to the comments contained within this response, and a comprehensive bush fire assessment report prepared in accordance with Chapter 3 Strategic Planning of PBP, the NSW RFS does not object to the proposal as shown in the plans attached to this email.

Carlo Di Giulio
Associate Director



0421 285 782 | (02) 9068 7500 | carlod@gyde.com.au
Level 6, 120 Sussex St, Sydney NSW 2000
gyde.com.au

