

DISCUSSION FORUM

DETAILS: RECREATION FACILITY INCLUDING HARNESS RACING TRACK,
LICENSED CLUB BUILDING AND STABLES, COLLEGE ROAD
SOUTH BATHURST

DATE: 19 DECEMBER 2012

PRESENT: CRAIG McKINNON (McKINNON DESIGN), DANNY DWYER
(BATHURST HARNESS RACING CLUB), MARK COLLINS
(BATHURST HARNESS RACING CLUB), SANJAY PERKASH
(LIGHTING SUPPLIER), DAVID WALKER (GEOLYSE), BILL
KIERATH (NEIGHBOUR), JULIE McGRATH (NEIGHBOUR),
CAROLYN McGRATH (NEIGHBOUR)

FILE: DA 2012/0416

Meeting Opened: 3.00pm

Mr Shaw: Welcomed everyone to the meeting. Explained that the Development Application would be determined by the Joint Regional Planning Panel (JRPP) as Council was the owner of the subject land. Explained that the minutes from this meeting would be forwarded to the JRPP along with the submissions.

Explained that Council is in the process of commissioning an independent Peer Review of the Acoustic Report submitted with the Development Application and that it was therefore not necessary to discuss the issue of noise at the meeting.

Mr Kierath: Asked if the new noise readings would be taken by the independent consultant.

Mr Shaw: Replied that Council is not specifically asking for new noise readings but that the independent consultant may choose to take new noise readings.

Mrs McGrath: Asked if Council could specifically ask for new noise readings.

Mr Shaw: Replied that Council would not specifically ask for new noise readings and that it was up to the independent consultant to decide if new readings are warranted or not.

Mr Kierath: Asked Mr Shaw to explain what the process is following the meeting.

Mr Shaw: Explained that Council would commission a Peer Review of the Acoustic Report and following that Council would prepare an assessment report for the JRPP. Upon receipt of the report the JRPP would conduct a site visit and on the same day have a meeting to determine the application. Explained that there would be an opportunity for those who lodged submissions to speak to the panel before the meeting.

Asked Mr Kierath to raise his points of concern with the proposal.

Mr Kierath: Raised the issue of safety, security and crime. Commented that there is currently zero crime in the area. Asked if the NSW Police had been consulted and what comments they had made.

Mr Shaw: Explained that the Development Application had been referred to NSW Police.

Mr Dwyer (BRC): Explained that NSW Police considered the proposed development to be a low to medium crime risk.

Mr Kierath: Commented that there is mention in the documents submitted with the application that a development should not increase the risk of crime.

Mr Walker: Explained that the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Guidelines were mentioned in the document in Section 5.2 and that the principles were considered in the design.

Mr Shaw: Explained that Council will take the advice of NSW Police in relation to crime risk and if they are satisfied with the proposal then crime is not considered to be an issue.

Mr Kierath: Reiterated that there is a zero risk of crime at the present time.

Mr Shaw: Explained that that NSW Police are responsible for making a determination on crime risk and reviewing the proposal against the CPTED principles.

Mrs McGrath: Commented that her family live in what is now a rural area and there has been no history of crime in the area.

Mr Kierath: Asked what was planned for the underutilised land.

Mr Walker: Asked Mr Kierath to explain what he meant by "underutilised land".

Mr Kierath: Explained that he was referring to the parts of the site not used for this proposal.

Mr Dwyer (HRC): Explained that the entire site would be maintained.

Mrs McGrath: Raised concerns about other potential uses on the site other than harness racing.

Mr Shaw: Explained that no other uses were proposed under this application and that further Development Applications would need to be lodged for any future additional uses and the impacts of such uses would be considered at the time.

Mr Collins: Explained that the harness Racing Club have no plans for additional uses at this stage.

Mr Kierath: Asked what assurances there will be for maintenance in the future.

Mr Shaw: Comment that if the unused parts of the site are not maintained it would be no different to the current situation where the site is covered with long grass.

Mrs McGrath: Comment that the site could become a fire hazard if it is not maintained.

Mr Shaw:	Explained that the Rural Fire Service were responsible for dealing with fire hazard complaints.
Mr Dwyer (HRC)	Explained that the Harness Racing Club has a full time track curator who is responsible for maintenance of the track and grounds.
Mr Kierath:	Raised concerns about traffic on surrounding roads and questioned the location of the traffic counter from which data was taken for the traffic report.
Mr Shaw:	Explained that Council's Traffic Engineers had reviewed the Traffic Study submitted with the application and were satisfied with its contents.
Mr Kierath:	Asked why traffic counts from a point south of Ethelton Avenue were used and not a point further north where existing traffic levels are higher.
Mr Walker:	Explained that Council was responsible for the traffic counts. Explained that after receiving Mr Kierath's submission Geolyse had reviewed their traffic data but had concluded that nothing needed to be changed.
Mr Kierath:	Asked if traffic assessment was based on an 80km/h speed limit.
Mr Walker:	Replied that the traffic assessment was based on a 60km/h speed limit.
Mr Kierath:	Asked if the estimated increase in traffic could be maintained on the existing road network.
Mr Walker:	Explained that the Traffic Study had determined that, with proposed development would, the surrounding road network would be operating within capacity. Estimated that the roads would be operating at 80% capacity at peak times.
Mr Shaw:	Explained that Council's Engineers would review the Traffic Study and the data in it and provide him with comment for his assessment report.
Mr Kierath:	Asked why traffic counts from a point south of Ethelton Avenue were used and not a point further north where existing traffic levels are higher. Commented that he felt the neighbours were being deceived.
Mr Shaw:	Commented that Mr Keirath's issues with traffic had been noted and would be addressed in his assessment report for the JRPP. Explained that he would ask why the traffic count was taken at that particular point and not further north.
Mr Kierath:	Raised concerns about waste and effluent. Raised particular concern about solids such as straw being washed into the sewer.
Mr McKinnon:	Explained that solid waste such as straw is taken off the site and that only liquid waste would go into the sewer.
Mr Walker:	Explained that solid waste is trucked off-site which is the same situation as the existing facility at the showground.
Mr Shaw:	Explained that the management of waste was subject to numerous pieces of legislation, guidelines and Council policies.
Mr McKinnon:	Commented that waste is a highly regulated area.

Mr Shaw:	Explained that the Harness Racing Club would need to enter into a Trade Waste Agreement with Council before anything entered the sewer.
Mr McKinnon:	Commented that nobody was trying deceive the concerned neighbours.
Ms McGrath:	Raised concerns about dust given that she has several asthmatic children.
Mr Dwyer (HRC):	Explained that the track is watered regularly, even between races. Explained that the access road from College Road would be sealed. Explained that the Harness Racing Club has a full time track curator responsible for watering the track. Explained that the club had recently purchased a new water truck.
Mr Keirath:	Raised concerns that the Traffic Study failed to deal with traffic generated by trainers using the track outside of race times.
Mr Walker:	Explained that the Traffic Study had been based on worst case scenario being the peak times when a major event was being held. Explained that the traffic generated by trainer's movements would be significantly less than the traffic generated by a major event.
Mr Kierath:	Commented that Mr Shaw wants to close Ethelton Avenue.
Mr Walker:	Explained that the closure of Ethelton Avenue was suggested in order to address the issue of increased traffic at the level crossing. Explained that no decision had been made on where the closure would occur.
Mr McGrath:	Explained that she has a serious lung condition and may need urgent medical attention. Raised concerns about getting medical attention when College Road is congested with traffic heading to or from the site.
Mr Shaw:	Explained that in an emergency it would be necessary to stop the traffic.
Mr Collins:	Explained that security guards would be on site for major events and that they would be able to stop the traffic to let emergency service vehicles through if necessary.
Mrs McGrath:	Asked if extra lanes should be added to College Road.
Mr Shaw:	Explained that there would still be congestion on College Road even if two lanes were provided in each direction at peak times.
Mrs McGrath:	Raised concerns about security and the potential increase in crime. Raised concerns about the devaluation of her property.
Mr Shaw:	Explained that there were numerous court cases where it had been determined that property values were not a valid considered under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.
Ms McGrath:	Commented that the impact of the proposal on the resident's existing rural lifestyle had not been properly considered.
Mr Shaw:	Commented that nothing in town planning stayed the same.

Mrs McGrath: Commented that it was her understanding that no new development would occur in the Mount Panorama area.

Mr Shaw: Explained that new development was permitted however there would be no new dwellings and no further rezonings for residential purposes.

Thanked everyone for attending the meeting and closed the meeting.

Meeting Closed: 3.35pm


D R Shaw
DIRECTOR
ENVIRONMENTAL, PLANNING & BUILDING SERVICES

