

MINUTES OF THE HUNTER & CENTRAL COAST REGION JOINT REGIONAL PLANNING PANEL MEETING HELD AT GOSFORD CITY COUNCIL ON THURSDAY 18 AUGUST 2011 AT 1.00PM

PRESENT: KARA KRASON – ACTING CHAIR
BOB McCOTTER - PANEL MEMBER
GREG FLYNN - PANEL MEMBER
GARY LOFTS - PANEL MEMBER

IN ATTENDANCE: FRED DOBBS – GOSFORD CITY COUNCIL
PETER PEGG – GOSFORD CITY COUNCIL
STEPHEN GOODWORTH - GOSFORD CITY COUNCIL

APOLOGY: NIL

1. The meeting commenced at 1pm.

2. **Declarations of Interest - Nil**

3. **Business Items**

ITEM 1 - 2010HCC031 Gosford 39396/2010 - Proposed Expansion of Existing Free Range Poultry Farm to include 4 additional Naturally Ventilated Poultry Sheds; Lot 813 DP 529990 No 80 Bloodtree Road MANGROVE MOUNTAIN

4. **Public Submission –**

1.	Mr. Ned Mortensen- owner	Addressed the Panel in support of item
2.	Mr. Dick Benbow- Principal of Benbow Environmental- Noise, Dust and Odour Consultants	Addressed the Panel on behalf of the Applicant
3.	Veronica Hockings spoke on behalf of Neil Stapleton	Addressed the Panel on behalf of Neil Stapleton against the item
4.	Lorraine Hawdon	Addressed the Panel against the item
5.	Karen Stapleton	Addressed the Panel against the item

5. **Business Item Recommendations**

2010HCC031 Gosford 39396/2010 - Proposed Expansion of Existing Free Range Poultry Farm to include 4 additional Naturally Ventilated Poultry Sheds; Lot 813 DP 529990 No 80 Bloodtree Road MANGROVE MOUNTAIN

MOVED by Gary Lofts, seconded by Bob McCotter that the Joint Regional Planning Panel adopt the recommendation in the Council report to refuse consent to Development Application No 39396/2010 for proposed expansion of free range poultry farm to include (four) 4 additional naturally ventilated sheds on Lot 813 DP 529990 in accordance with the reasons for refusal listed in the report and modified by the Panel. The modified reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposal creates unreasonable and non-compliant impacts on air quality (odour) and noise (from trucking movements in particular) to a number of nearby sensitive receptors. The additional impacts do not comply with the relevant guidelines of DECCW or the Industrial Noise Policy.
- 2 The proposal creates an intensified land use that conflict with surrounding properties and the adjoining 7(b) zone in particular which contains most of the sensitive receptors.
- 3 The proposed Farm Management Plan is considered unsatisfactory.
- 4 The EIS has not satisfactorily addressed or appropriately considered the following:
 - the impacts on nearby sensitive receptors particularly regarding odour and noise impacts,
 - social disadvantages to the surrounding area - the justification for the proposal incorrectly states there will be no significant social disadvantages for the surrounding area,
 - appropriate alternatives such as a smaller development and/or a staged development to monitor impacts before further development,
 - The provisions of SEPP 33 as the proposal is classified as a “*potentially offensive industry*” under the provisions of the SEPP.
 - The impact particularly in relation to air quality on the adjoining sportsground at Lot 81 DP 664567.
- 5 The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site with regard to its size, shape and distance from nearby sensitive receptors. The additional sheds are unable to be located a sufficient distance from sensitive receptors to minimise air quality and noise impacts.
- 6 The proposal is inconsistent with the relevant objectives of the 1(a) Rural (Agriculture) zone.
- 7 The proposal does not comply with the relevant objective of SREP 8 - Central Coast Plateau Areas and relevant strategies of SREP 20 – Hawkesbury-Nepean River.
- 8 Approval to the proposal is not in the public interest due to the potential additional odour and noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors.
- 9 Insufficient information has been submitted regarding an appropriate Water Cycle Management Plan that makes provision for adequate disposal of stormwater, on site detention and appropriate nutrient control facilities.
- 10 Insufficient information has been submitted to properly assess driveway gradient and turning area compliance with the provisions of AS2890.2 for commercial off-street parking.

- B The applicant is advised of Joint Regional Planning Panel decision and of their right to appeal to the Land and Environment Court within 12 months after the date of determination.
- C The objectors are notified of Joint Regional Planning Panel decision.
- D The External Authorities be notified of the Joint Regional Planning Panel decision.

MOTION CARRIED 4 - 0

The meeting concluded at 1.35pm

Endorsed by

Kara Krason
Acting Chair
Hunter and Central Coast Joint Regional Planning Panel
Date: 15 August 2011