



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1096454

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH COUNCIL

RE: GATEWAY REVIEW SOUTHGATE

PANEL: **CHRIS WILSON**
STEPHEN O'CONNOR

ASSISTING PANEL: **CASEY JOSHUA**

CLARENCE VALLEY COUNCIL: **ADAM CAMERON**
DES SCHRODER
TERRY DWYER

LOCATION: **IPC OFFICES**
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: **1.02 PM, WEDNESDAY, 20 NOVEMBER 2019**

MR C. WILSON: Hi, Chris Wilson here. Before we begin, I would just like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we all meet. I would also like to pay my respects to their Elders past and present and to the Elders from other communities who may be here today or are with us today. Welcome to the
5 teleconference today to discuss the request for review of the Department's Gateway Determination for the planning proposal at 112-134 School Lane, Southgate. The Gateway Determine found it not to proceed.

10 My name is Chris Wilson, and I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow Commissioner Steve O'Connor and assisting the panel is Casey Joshua from the Commission Secretariat. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's conference is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website. The teleconference is one part of the commission's process. It is taking place at the
15 preliminary stage. It will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate.

20 If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice, provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website. I request that all participants introduce themselves each time before speaking and ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. So if I could be so kind as to ask you, ah, well, we will introduce ourselves for the benefit of the transcript. My
25 name's Chris Wilson and I am the Chair of the Panel.

MR S. O'CONNOR: And I am Steve O'Connor, a Commissioner with the IPC.

30 MS JOSHUA: Casey Joshua, for the Secretariat.

MR A. CAMERON: Adam Cameron, I'm the manager of environment, development and strategic planning at Clarence Valley Council.

35 MR SCHRODER: And Des Schroder, director of environment, planning and community, Clarence Valley Council.

MR T. DWYER: And I'm Terry Dwyer, strategic planning coordinator at the Council. Hi.

40 MR WILSON: Thank you, gentlemen. Um, thank you for the introductions. So to start off with, I guess we'll throw over to Council and just ask you to give an overview of your, your, ah, your assessment report or your planning report to Council. Your recommendations to Council. I guess, it's not really fair, we, oh, and to give us an overview of the decision.
45

MR CAMERON: Terry, you go.

MR DWYER: Oh, okay. Um, it's Terry speaking here. I'll provide a bit of an overview of that report. Um, basically, um, the, well, before I get to the recommendation and the resolution, the – the planners report, um, you know, just provided a background as to what, ah, was actually, ah, being entertained or
5 proposed by the, ah, by the planning proposal which was, in essence, a – to swap around dwelling types from dwelling entitlements on land that are all in the same ownership, by the way. In, I guess, flood lane, a flood prone rural area. Ah, just to the east or northeast of Southgate Hamlet. To, ah, to take those dwelling entitlements, if you like, up to a higher area to the northwest along school lane.

10 Ah, to adjacent to lands, ah, held by the same ownership. Ah, also zoned rural, ah, and to basically propose, ah, oh, I guess, a six, a six hectare minimum. So ah, I guess, to have it all as a quasi-rural residential situation and also have an offer of giving up or extinguishing the so-called dwelling entitlements on the, ah, on the
15 larger lots to the northeast of Southgate. So that, in a sense, was the planned proposal which was summarised in the planners report. So ah, it identified and discussed and assessed key issues, um, under the headings of Strategic Justification, Minimum Lot Size, Flooding and the, ah, Proposal to have a Covenant or Agreement about the Extinguishment of the Dwelling Entitlements.

20 It also identified precedent as an issue. Ah, it identified three options or parts for the Council itself to consider. And, ah, the, ah, it made an officer recommendation of; of it not being the officer recommendation was to not support it for four reasons. So you want me to read those four reasons out? Or - - -

25 MR WILSON: If you could just summarise them that would be good. Thanks.

MR DWYER: Yeah. Ah, well, the reasons given in the printed report was, ah, that the proposal doesn't, ah, minimise fragmentation of agricultural land and is therefore
30 not strategically supported by the Minister's directions and, and by Council strategies. The land is therefore not strategically supported by the Minister's directions and, and by Council strategies. The land was not contiguous and has potentially adverse implications across the whole floodplain. The small lots at School lane are not consistent with rural character, not contiguous with a lower
35 density, ah, residential zone and the, ah, the proposed covenant, ah, does not adequately restrict dwellings on a subject lot.

So um, when it went to the Council vote, ah, the Council, ah, resolved to support the planning proposal, ah, as presented and entirely conditional on the registration of the
40 covenant on the Southgate Ferry Road properties. Ah, they're in favour of Council to deflect that dwelling, dwelling construction as prohibited on the subject properties. And that was, yeah, that was the Council resolution.

MR WILSON: Okay.

45 MR DWYER: Okay.

MR WILSON: Do you want the next one?

MR O'CONNOR: Yep. Okay. Thank you. It's Steve O'Connor here. Um,
perhaps you can talk a little bit about, um, the strategic documents you, you looked at
5 and that might be relevant to Southgate that we, we should have regard to?

MR WILSON: Can I just add to that, ah, Steve, the applicant has said, ah, basically
has said to us, categorically that the Council's Local Settlement Strategy does not
Apply.
10

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR WILSON: Is that what you're asking?

15 MR O'CONNOR: Yes. And I'm just wondering if you could tell us or if you could,
um, articulate the implications of your settlement strategy to the proposal?

MR DWYER: I assume, um, what's meant there is the Clarence Valley Settlement
Strategy.
20

MS JOSHUA: Yes. Sorry.

MR DWYER: Ah, which actually dates back to 1999 when, prior to amalgamation.
But all the Councils at the time in the Clarence Valley got together to do a combined,
25 if you like, a generic style settlement strategy. So yeah, look, the – it would be fair
to say that, um, that strategy is, um, in terms of specifics is silent, certainly silent on,
um, not only, like a, like a proposal like this. But probably silent on specific policies
for – for areas like Southgate in terms of settlement. So I did have a bit of a look this
morning to, um, yeah, to see if there was anything in there that could be, um, that
30 could be used in either support or non-support of a proposal like this.

And you, you really wouldn't necessarily, you know, find anything either way to.
You know, it's just entirely silent on it. So we said so. But we wouldn't have an
official policy answer, expressed in a strategy at this stage.
35

MR SCHRODER: It's Des Schroder here, I mean, the, the context is, though, I
mean, why – the Southgate area is area is very flood prone, obviously. And, and,
you know, and the village itself goes under in a flood. It's one of the areas that does
go, there's been quite a bit of house raising there but it still goes underwater. So any
40 settlement strategy done in the past didn't explicitly include it because, basically, it's
not a great area to, actually, encourage people – they get isolated there – they've got
to be serviced by boat, ah, to actually have a settlement strategy.

Where our settlements have gone is all, is all-up in areas outside the flood plains,
45 Junction Hill, ah, down around MacLean, they're all above the flood, 100 year flood
level. And that's where the major settlement pattern was actually earmarked if you
look at our settlement strategy. So – Southgate wasn't mentioned one way or the

other. But it actually, it doesn't, it just doesn't exclude it, I guess you could say. But reality is, from a – from a logical point of view, you wouldn't include it either because it's actually highly – highly – flood prone.

5 MR O'CONNOR: It's Steve O'Connor here. Could you just expand a bit more on where the strategy does indicate, you know, rural residential type allotments should be created in that – that vicinity? You've mentioned Junction Hill, um, which I - - -

MR SCHRODER: Oh, that – that was residential.

10

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MR SCHRODER: Rural residential is mainly, like, is mainly around areas like Gulmarrad, ah, basically, Ashby, um, Lawrence has got some larger blocks on the
15 Lawrence village, but that's – that's further down. Ah, out at – out at Coutts Crossing, ah, basically, there's some blocks around Waterview Heights, that sort of area. So basically, again, outside the floodplain area. Most of those areas are all outside the flood – flood is a big issue for us. And so, yeah, if you want to get more people in those areas, we have indicated that that's where they – where they should
20 go. So and that's gone way back in some of the Council planning going way back, actually.

MR O'CONNOR: So is it fair to say that strategy is probably getting a bit outdated now and is Council looking at revamping it?

25

MR SCHRODER: No. The actual settlement strategy as – as we go, we're just looking at it at the moment. So it's actually Des Schroder again here. It's actually quite, quite a useful strategy. It's actually identified mainly where we're going to put, ah, you know, residential development. We're not – we're not encouraging too
30 much rural residential development at all. Because we've probably got enough of that. Ah, and the area that's put it in is, is there's still logical areas. It's – it's, um, and a lot of that strategy hasn't been implemented in the past, because we haven't had the population growth that was, maybe, was predicted.

35 And, ah, those – those areas are good land, they're outside the floodplain, they're essentially cleared in most places. And, and there's plenty of land, there's tonnes of it. So basically, we've got – we've got enough residential land zoned about 7,000 lots. So - - -

40 MR O'CONNOR: Oh.

MR SCHRODER: - - - ah, we don't need another area. Another – another area. We've basically got lots of, there's enough lots, we have got availability of land to, basically, and a lot of that land, by the way, is being developed as we speak. But
45 basically – basically, um, there's no need to revise the settlement strategy at the moment. And we're looking at our local, um, strategy now. You know, the new one we've got to do for the fee. And we won't be actually asking for any more zoned

land in that, in that strategy with the, you know, the local, the local strategy we're just doing right at the moment.

5 MR O'CONNOR: So it's Steve O'Connor again. Can you just expand on that statement you made about you're "not looking to find new areas for rural residential." Why is that? You've got surplus - - -

MR WILSON: No need.

10 MR SCHRODER: We've already got plenty zoned. We've got plenty of rural residential zoned in these other areas in the valley. We're a big valley. And there's, there's land sitting there, for instance, at Gulmarrad, there's, I think there's 500 lots still available. Um, out at, ah, basically, around, ah, Coutts Crossing, I don't know how much is out there, but it would be quite a bit. And there is, and there's, you
15 know, there is - you're in the thousands of lots, basically, which are available for development across the valley, basically, in rural residential areas. So we don't need a new rural residential area, basically.

MR O'CONNOR: Good. Thank you.
20

MR WILSON: In - in your report, it suggests - Chris Wilson here, sorry - in your report, it suggests there is uncertainty associated with the proposal to extinguish the entitlements as part of the planned proposal. Can you just elaborate on those
25 uncertainties, if - if possible, please?

MR DWYER: Sure. Okay. It's Terry here. Um, yeah, look, I've made some notes, ah, this morning in relation to that, ah, question on the agenda. Okay. So that proposal, um, to extinguish, um, two dwelling entitlements or eligibilities, as we also call them here, ah, relate to, um, lot - lot 61.
30

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR DWYER: Ah, I won't quote the DP number, but it's down Southgate Ferry Road. And the, ah, and the nearby lots 1 and 2, ah, Southgate Ferry Road area. So -
35 so basically, if a covenant was placed on the, ah, on the title of those lots, ah, now and between 23 December 2021 that stipulated no dwelling is to be constructed on the land, it would, it would be inconsistent with the LEP. Um, um, that is that we believe that a covenant couldn't seek to prohibit what, what would be for the time being permissible under the LEP. So after December - 20th of December '21.
40

So the, ah, if you like, the Sunset Clause, um, on dwelling, on certain dwelling entitlements, um, I guess, lapses. Um, the, I guess, the question of eligibility and the covenant becomes a moot point because if they - if those lots don't, if they don't get built on or they don't lodge a DA within that period and get approval, um, for a
45 dwelling, um, they wouldn't be able to exercise a dwelling, you know, the dwelling entitlement beyond 20th of December, '21. So - - -

MR O'CONNOR: So Terry, it's Steve O'Connor. That point you just made - - -

MR DWYER: Yeah.

5 MR O'CONNOR: - - - about the, um, the extinguishing of dwelling entitlements, can you give us some sort of understanding of how many dwelling entitlements might be out there that will be extinguished in two years' time. And just so, we can get an understanding of the implications?

10 MR DWYER: Ah, well, ah, certainly, it wouldn't be accurate by any means. But if we're also encompassing the, ah, um, ah, just the ordinary rule. So the less than 40 hectares and didn't have Council approval there, and still might have a, a, notional dwelling entitlement, there – there could be, there still could be hundreds, possibly, out there.

15 MR WILSON: Right.

MR O'CONNOR: It's potentially hundreds, yes. We haven't done an audit on that.

20 MS JOSHUA: Have there been many of those lots - - -

MR O'CONNOR: That's a fair - - -

25 MS JOSHUA: Sorry. Casey Joshua here. Have there been many of those lots that have started lodging development application or have received development consent?

30 MR O'CONNOR: There's been a bit of interest in activity, but I doubt you'll, you know – number of applications since December 2020 – since December 2011 when the current LEP was made and, therefore, you know, with this sunset provision I'm not sure, like, how many applications have, under the dwelling house clause where the, you know – where the lots are less than 40 hectares of, you know, how many applications for – well, there's been - - -

35 MR WILSON: Are you - - -

MR O'CONNOR: There's been a bit more interest - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

40 MR O'CONNOR: - - - with the knowledge of the sunset - - -

MR WILSON: Chris Wilson again. Are you able to shed some light on why – why they have the sunset clause or what the objective of the sunset clause is?

45 MR SCHRODER: Yes. It's Des Schroder here. The issue was when we did LEP back in 2011 we decided with the Department of Agriculture and – and their

issue was in this – what they figured was a 40-hectare block in the – within 60 , I think it is, of Grafton, if you like, or that area was actually seen as a viable lot.

MR WILSON: Right.

5

MR SCHRODER: They didn't see small lots. You can argue a little bit different, I'm sure, I guess, maybe, but they did argue that 40 hectares was a viable enterprise and they didn't want to see – they were arguing as we go further it's actually a 100-hectare spot But this – you know, within that 60k radius, and that was the argument that we went with on the LEP.

10

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR SCHRODER: And which was adopted by government, I might add, so, you know, this is – it's going to be law, so they – and so people, if they're going to do it they need to do it by 2021 otherwise they'll, you know, default to the 40 hectares.

15

MR WILSON: Thank you. Steve.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Steve O'Connor again. I just want to be clear why – and we're back to School Lane now – why there's four lots there but there's only two with dwelling entitlements. Can you just explain why the Lot 2 and Lot 4 don't have dwelling entitlements?

20

MR DWYER: Okay. Terry here. I'll seek to do that without having yet found the subdivision file that underlies the creation of that DP 574006, but I – the DP itself, the registered deposited plan for 574006 does have a notation under – I see that says:

25

It is intended, secondly, that Lots 1 and 2 and Lots 3 and 4 shall be consolidated and shall not be sold from one another.

30

So the reason why I would've liked to have seen the file, the DA for subdivision would've been to see if there was a – what the underlying reason was, which I suspect is the – those lots may not have had dwelling entitlement, perhaps, those Lots 2 and 4. But I note that Lots 1 and 2 haven't been consolidated and Lots 3 and 4 haven't been consolidated despite the 1974 model deposited plan.

35

MR O'CONNOR: It does seem strange that they created the lots and then said you had to consolidate them.

40

MR DWYER: There's a – well there's still a little bit of a history that may only be found by looking at the subdivision file.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. And you don't know the date of that DP, do you? You haven't got it there?

45

MR DWYER: Ah, yes. Well, it was registered on – well, actually, the council clerk's sign-off was 21 October '74, but I note that the copy I've got off our system doesn't have a registration date, so we'd probably have to – if we don't have a copy of the registered DP we'd probably have to get one New South Wales Registry.

5

MR O'CONNOR: No. That's fine. Just the council clerk certificate gives me an idea of how long ago it was when that subdivision was created. Thank you. Now coming to just the question of flooding. And just to understand what the flood risk, because we have some reports including the council reports. They've got some figures in them and those plans show, you know, a flood planning area and a probably maximum flood that – in figure 1, but don't give us any idea of the depth of flooding or the velocity of the flows in that area. Can you just enlighten us for both the site in the flood plan and the site out of the flood plan in School Lane, what the flooding hazard is for those areas?

10
15

MR DWYER: Yes. Sure. Okay. It's Terry here to respond to that. All right. I did most of my research this morning in relation to the areas down at Southgate Ferry Road, so I'll start first with that. Just across that immediate area there, including both sets of lots of, you know – both locations, the one-in-a-hundred-year flood level, the upper range is 6.35 metres AHD, so the level ranges between 6.24 to the upper range of 6.35 metres AHD, and I noted that both Lots 61 and Lots 1 and 2 down at Southgate Ferry Road they pretty well – most of their lands were four metres or less AHD, the level there.

20

I'd say pretty well 100 per cent of Lot 61 is four metres or less in in metres height – AHD. And probably at least 90 per cent of Lots 1 and 2 would be – 90 per cent of that would be less than four metres, so I guess based on the simple maths here you're looking at 2.35 metres depth up to 2.35 metres depth inundation in a one-in-a-hundred flood. So I did have a very quick look at the flooding up at School Lane and particularly that at Lots 2 and 4, the majority of those were covered by the one-in-a-hundred flood, I noted. But that lane keeps rising there to Lots 1 and 3, so there's, you know – it's flood-free towards School Lane there in that location.

25

30

MR O'CONNOR: And what about velocity of flows, Terry? Any idea?

35

MR DWYER: Yes. I had a quick look at the velocity layer but I couldn't find a – an associated legend, so the more frenetic looking arrows appear to be in the main stream of the Clarence River channel and there were different annotations associated with these lots then and still to Southgate Ferry Road. But I did find on our system what was called a Clarence Floodway Mapping Layer and it indicated that down at Southgate Ferry Road both Lots 1 and 2 and the norther part of Lot 61 were included within what was called Clarence Floodway.

40

So I haven't had enough time to speak to our flooding people as to, you know, get an interpretation of what, you know, that actually meant, but, you know, that same layer shows the main channel of Clarence River as a floodway, so there is a creek that runs in it. Some creek-type system that runs in adjacent to Southgate, or along Southgate

45

Ferry Road and even bordering Lawrence Road there, if you like. It shows a bit of this floodway polygon.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Thank you.

5

MR DWYER: So that could indicate greater velocity, possibly, and – so the areas that aren't within that floodway polygon.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. Okay. Do you mind talking with your flood engineers and just getting that information back to us at a later date?

10

MR DWYER: Yes, if I can get some – yes, it's Terry again – if I can get something on velocity, all right, from them, I'll – I can do that, yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Good. Okay.

15

MR DWYER: Yes. Sure.

MR O'CONNOR: And just while we're talking about flooding impacts, if we go to figure – I think it's figure 1 on the second page of your council officer's report. And that relates to the School Lane land. It just seemed there was no legend with this figure so it's a bit difficult to understand. It has a very rectangular line for where I think it's flood-prone and not flood-prone. Can you just explain what those different colours and lines mean on that figure for us?

20

MR DWYER: Sure. Yes. Yes. It's Terry here. Look, the area that's mapped blue, or, up to the little wavy line there, that is actually the area that is inundated up to the one-in-a-hundred-flood level. So that is the flood planning area below, but also the area that's – yes, that's inundated in all floods up to one-in-a-hundred-year ARI or one-in-a-hundred-year. There's a couple of areas beyond the blue that's still got wavy lines with – well, with the underlined zoning, but the outer edge of that is the probably maximum flood line, which is a larger flood that ranges at an upper level 8.36 metres AHD, and that's how the mapping system has portrayed – yes, in that very, you know, pixely or rectangular-type sense so – and beyond that line is deemed to be, you know, beyond, you know, that floodplaining level and what we call – well, what is called a PMF or Probable Maximum Flood level.

25

30

35

MR O'CONNOR: So am I correct to look at the bone-coloured land. You're saying that's completely flood-free?

40

MR DWYER: Yes. That's right.

MR O'CONNOR: And then what's the land that might be subject to a PMF event but not the one-in-a-hundred-year event?

45

MR DWYER: In between the wavy line and the other wavy line that's there by the blue. So anything - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. I see.

MR DWYER: Yes, that's right. So - - -

5 MR O'CONNOR: Right. Okay. That helps a lot. I couldn't understand that figure.

MR DWYER: It's very – yes.

10 MR SCHRODER: They've done them on lot boundaries or something, by the look of it.

MR DWYER: Yes. It's very clunky, and when they go into geographical information systems, that's how they sometimes get portrayed.

15 MR O'CONNOR: Yes. Okay. That's good. And I think my last question relates to just a statement that was made by the people putting forward the planning proposal. They referred back to the Clarence Valley Floodplain Management Study and the council report says that that's no longer relevant. It's been superseded by the Grafton and Lower Clarence Floodplain Risk Management Plan, but then they
20 claimed that – in their submission that that original study, the – I think it was – was it 2011 – that study was called up in the more recent study. Is that consistent with what council's belief is? We just, yes, got a little bit confused there.

MR DWYER: Yes. Terry here. Yes, the 2007 Grafton and Lower Clarence
25 Floodplain Risk Management Plan, did make a reference to that earlier 1980 document at one point. The particular reference in the proponent's planning proposal at page 6 of that, that is part of one of the dot points on that page 34 of the Flood Risk Management Plan Study. The proponent's planning proposal quoted the first
30 sentence of that dot point, which was, you know:

On larger rural properties there may be some scope to relocate severely flood-affected dwellings to an area of less risk within the same property.

35 But the Floodplain Risk Management – the Council – like, the source of that from the council Floodplain Risk Management Plan did have – that dot point had a second sentence which reads:

This could be provided under incentives suggested under voluntary house-raising schemes.

40

So the proponent didn't quote the full context, if you like, of that, which was the voluntary house raising, and I was informed this morning that council discontinued its voluntary house-raising scheme in May 2017 for financial reasons.

45 MR O'CONNOR: So what period did it discontinue? What time? Or a date?

MR DWYER: I believe council resolved in May 2017 to discontinue its voluntary house-raising scheme.

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you. Okay.

5

MR DWYER: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Look, I think that concludes the questions I have. I don't know about Chris.

10

MR WILSON: Yes. Just in relation to the rural land set and the clause in your LEP which basically says that there's not to be a significant impact on rural lands, I'm just wondering if you can comment because the applicant submitted to us that the rationale behind the PPs is because there is less impact on subdividing the land along Southgate Lane than there is by extinguishing those lots closer to the river. Can you comment on that a bit, please? I don't know if I've articulated that properly, but the clause in your LEP says that there's not to be a significant impact on the productivity of the land. Is that correct?

15

MR DWYER: The LEP? Terry here. I'll have to take your word for it for the moment.

20

MR WILSON: I guess the premise that this shouldn't proceed is based on the fragmentation of the existing lots along – yes?

25

MR DWYER: Pardon? Sorry.

MR WILSON: And the applicant's saying, basically, that the impact is negligible or non-existent in terms of agricultural productivity on those lots. Is that your understanding?

30

MR DWYER: Well, it's Terry. Like, if the dwelling entitlements on the lots at Southgate Ferry Road were to, like, you know, be forfeited, if you like, I mean, it'd be difficult to determine whether the land there continues in primary production or not, and it would be difficult to determine whether there would be an impact if dwellings were erected upon them, as, you know, they can gain consent for at the moment, so it's - - -

35

MR WILSON: Okay.

40

MR DWYER: Yes. It's probably difficult to really - - -

MR WILSON: To quantify.

MR DWYER: - - - prove one way or another, in reality.

45

MR WILSON: Yes. And they say that – they also submit there'll be no impact in relation to what is, essentially, the further fragmentation of that land on where they wish to subdivide. Yes. Did you have a view on that?

5 MR DWYER: Up in School Lane?

MR WILSON: Yes.

10 MR DWYER: Right. I'm in – Terry again. You know, like, if two more dwelling were to be erected each on a separate lot up there, for instance, again, you know, on one hand, for instance, you might say, well, it might impair the, you know, present or future agricultural pursuits on adjoining land, perhaps, if there were any future conflicts, but that could be argued on one hand. On the other hand, you know it could be argued that that wouldn't impair any existing or future, you know,
15 agricultural enterprises or pursuits in the adjoining area, for instance, so it just depends on what might happen in the immediate adjoining area where they seek to relocate these dwelling opportunities to.

20 MR WILSON: Are there any servicing issues up there?

MR DWYER: What, from a point of view of – what sort of servicing?

MR WILSON: Water, sewerage, roads.

25 MR DWYER: I mean, all you've got there is actually – roads? The road's okay. The biggest issue for servicing that area down there is if you do get a flood, you can't get out of there at all because the road goes under in the, probably, one-in-twenty-year-flood. The road goes under and, you know, people down there have had to be evacuated out, so there is the issue of evacuation but that's going to apply on the
30 blocks of land anyway. If they put house on that they'd have to build a mound - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

35 MR DWYER: - - - or put them up in the air. So basically there is – that's one of your issues down there. You have got a servicing issue and it's probably another reason to go to the 40-hectare blocks, by the way, to put less down there, generally, right?

40 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR DWYER: It's not a great area overall - - -

MR WILSON: So - - -

45 MR DWYER: - - - to build houses.

MR WILSON: But when you say down there – I’m sorry. I’m getting confused because I’m not familiar with the area.

MR DWYER: Southgate.

5

MS JOSHUA: Southgate.

MR DWYER: Southgate area.

10 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR DWYER: Southgate area.

MR WILSON: So what’s this area called?

15

MS JOSHUA: School Lane.

MR DWYER: In flood times, that area sits out – it’s probably the last area - - -

20 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR DWYER: - - - we can get people out of. It actually sits there isolated for a long time.

25 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR DWYER: Acknowledging there is dwelling eligibilities on some of those blocks, but - - -

30 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR DWYER: - - - they haven’t been actively encouraged in the expansion of Southgate for flooding reasons.

35 MR WILSON: Okay. And what about School Lane? It’s - - -

MR DWYER: Same issue. Same issue. You can’t still get out.

MR WILSON: Okay.

40

MR DWYER: You still get trapped down there.

MR WILSON: All right. Okay. All right. Look, I don’t – do you have any more questions?

45

MR O’CONNOR: No. No. Thank you. Thanks for your time.

MR WILSON: We really appreciate you for time, guys. Appreciate it. That's all we have at the moment. So you'll be able to – in terms of follow-up, you'll be able to provide us some information on velocity, in terms of the flooding?

5 MR DWYER: Yes. Terry here. Yes. I'll do that. Will I report back to Casey on that one?

MR O'CONNOR: Yes, please.

10 MR DWYER: Yes. I'll do that.

MR WILSON: Is there anything else you wish to add?

15 MR DWYER: It's Terry again. Probably not at this stage, no. I don't have anything further to have. I don't know whether my colleagues do.

MR SCHRODER: No. Nothing from me.

20 MR WILSON: I mean, just one other question. Have there been any subdivision applications or whatever in that School Lane area in recent times?

MR DWYER: Again, we'd have to take that on notice, I think, but I can't – you know, we handle a lot of them and - - -

25 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR DWYER: - - - can't really remember too many, but we need to have a look, I guess.

30 MR WILSON: Is that okay? If you could provide us that as well, that'd be useful.

MR DWYER: All right.

35 MR WILSON: Thank you very much.

MR DWYER: No worries.

MR SCHRODER: Thank you.

40 MS JOSHUA: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Bye.

45 MS JOSHUA: Bye.

MR DWYER: No worries. Goodbye.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[1.38 pm]