

**MINUTES OF HUNTER & CENTRAL COAST
JOINT REGIONAL PLANNING PANEL MEETING
HELD AT CIVIC CENTRE, QUEEN STREET, SINGLETON
ON THURSDAY, 10 OCTOBER 2013 at 5.00 PM**

Present:

Jason Perica – Acting Chair
Kara Krason – Panel Member
John Colvin – Panel Member
Councillor John Martin – Panel Member
Councillor Godfrey Adamthwaite – Panel Member

Council staff in attendance:

Alison Clarke – Senior Town Planner
Phil Carroll – Manager, Development and Regulatory Services
Richard Lamb – Visual Impact Expert
Bill Paterson – Flooding Expert
Tony Pickup – Legal Advisor

Apologies: Nil

1. The meeting commenced at 5.05 pm

The Chair welcomed everyone to the Hunter & Central Coast Joint Regional Planning Panel Meeting.

2. Declarations of Interest – Nil

3. Business Item -

Item 1 – 2013HCC004 – Temporary Accommodation Village, 319 Putty Road, Glenridding

4. Public Submissions –

Item 1 – 2013HCC004 – Temporary Accommodation Village, 319 Putty Road, Glenridding

Addressing the Panel against the item –

- David Heuston
- Rebecca Williams
- Dan Thompson
- Robert Ball
- James Baily
- Kerry Nichols
- Councillor Ruth Rogers

- Caitlin Paul
- Bruce Moore
- Tim Sneesby on behalf of Singleton Retired Miner Workers Association
- Councillor Robert Keown
- John Flannery on behalf of Better Future for Singleton Shire Association
- Tim Robertson on behalf of United Mine Workers Federation of Australia

Addressing the Panel in favour of the item –

- Peter Strudwick on behalf of the Mac Group

The panel meeting was adjourned at 7.18 pm.

The panel meeting recommenced at 7.53 pm.

Each member of the Panel briefly commented on aspects of the development application.

5. Panel Decision

Item 1 – 2013HCC004 – Temporary Accommodation Village, 319 Putty Road, Glenridding

That the JRPP refuse to grant consent to the development application, for the following reasons:

1. It is not free from doubt that the proposal is permissible within the 1(a) (Rural Zone) of *Singleton Local Environmental Plan 1996* as the purpose of the proposal may be characterised as a boarding house, notwithstanding its scale. It is also noted that there is some ambiguity related to the use given the flexibility of those to be offered accommodation (including “the public”) and thereby the length of stay and relationship with other abodes.

Even if the proposal is permissible with consent, consent should not be granted for the following reasons:

2. The proposed development is not consistent with the objectives of the 1(a)(Rural Zone) contained in *Singleton Local Environmental Plan 1996* and in particular objectives (a), (b), (d) and (e) of the zone, as follows:
 - (a) To protect and conserve agricultural land and to encourage continuing viable and sustainable agricultural land use,
 - (b) To promote the protection and preservation of natural ecological systems and processes,
 - (d) To maintain the scenic amenity and landscape quality of the area,
 - (e) To provide for the proper and co-ordinated use of rivers and water catchment areas,
3. The proposal is not permissible in the RU1 - Primary Production zone in *Singleton Local Environmental Plan 2013* (gazetted on 6 September 2013). While this in itself does not make the proposal prohibited, determinative weight should be given to the objectives of the zone, and the nature of the proposal in the context, zone objectives and future land uses within a different regime of permissible uses. The proposal, particularly noting its

use, size, scale and likely duration of use is inconsistent with the objectives of the RU1 zone, being:

- (a) To encourage sustainable primary industry production by maintaining and enhancing the natural resource base.
 - (b) To encourage diversity in primary industry enterprises and systems appropriate for the area.
 - (c) To minimise the fragmentation and alienation of resource lands.
 - (d) To minimise conflict between land uses within this zone and land uses within adjoining zones.
4. The proposed development is not consistent with the aims and rural planning principals of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Rural Lands) 2008*.
5. The proposed development does not have a suitable evacuation route in case of flooding, and has not adequately demonstrated that there will be acceptable impacts in relation to local flooding events ("The Doughboy").
6. The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the landscape and scenic qualities of the local area. Accordingly it would be incompatible with the rural character of the area.
7. The proposed development does not adequately balance social, economic and environmental impacts on the community and area.
8. The subject site is not suitable for the proposed development given:
- (a) The site is located within a low density rural area and the proposed development is not compatible with the surrounding landscape, traditional built form or density;
 - (b) The site is identified as flood prone land;
 - (c) A suitable evacuation route, in case of flooding, is not available
 - (d) The site has the potential to contain Aboriginal sites that could be impacted upon;
 - (e) The site is Class 3 agricultural land and the proposed development will sterilise the site and fragment the surrounding agricultural land;
 - (f) The site is visually exposed and has limited natural screening opportunities;
 - (g) The site's location in a rural locality away from the developed urban area will result in inappropriately located light spillage and sky glow.
9. The applicant has submitted inadequate information to enable conclusions to be drawn by Council staff in relation to contamination, acoustic assessment, flooding, potential aboriginal impacts and that appropriate provision for water and sewer can be achieved.
10. Granting consent would not be in the public interest in accordance with Section 79C(1)(e) Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, noting the potential precedent and the considerable opposition to the proposal.

Motion by – John Colvin; **Seconded by** – John Martin

Motion carried unanimously

6. Meeting closed at 8.00 pm

Endorsed by



Jason Perica
Acting Chair
Hunter & Central Coast
Joint Regional Planning Panel
Date: 16 October 2013