



Notes of briefing with the Proponent

This meeting is part of the advice process.		
Meeting note taken by Robert Bisley	Date: 19 February 2018	Time: 10:00am-11:15am
Project: Planning Proposal PP_2015_WARRI_001_00 to rezone land at the western end of Ralston Avenue, Belrose.		
Meeting place: Belrose Bowling Club		
<p>Attendees:</p> <p>Commission Members: Ms Abigail Goldberg (Chair), Ms Annelise Tuor and Mr Stephen O'Connor</p> <p>Commission Secretariat: David Mooney (Team Leader) and Robert Bisley (Senior Planning Officer)</p> <p>Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council (the Proponent): John Wynne (Urbis), Jennifer Cooper (Urbis), Peter Darling, Dominic Sullivan, Nathan Moran, Sam Haddad, Rod Rose, Jeremy Purvel, John Travers (Travers Bushfire and Ecology).</p>		
The purpose of the meeting: For the applicant to brief the Commission on the Planning Proposal to rezone land at the western end of Ralston Avenue, Belrose.		
<p>The proponent prepared a PowerPoint presentation and briefed the Commission on the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A summary of the site and related planning history: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council's involvement with the site. ○ A summary of the Planning Proposal and subdivision layout of the site. ○ The proponent has prepared a draft Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) to the value of \$16m. Council did not support the proposed VPA when it resolved not to support the Planning Proposal. ○ The former Sydney East Joint Regional Planning Panel determined that the Planning Proposal should proceed to Gateway on the 23 July 2014. ○ Since the Gateway Review, Council has opposed the Planning Proposal and in its recent decision identified 15 grounds of refusal. The proponent asserts that Council altered its position from support to fierce objection. ○ The Planning Proposal offers opportunity for the Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council to fund Aboriginal community initiatives both on-site and in the local area. ○ The community has not raised significant opposition to the Planning Proposal. ○ The Planning Proposal is consistent with the Plan for Growing Sydney, Draft District Plan and also the Premier's priorities. It is also consistent with the relevant State Environmental Planning Policies and s117 Ministerial Directions. ○ The Oxford Falls Strategic Review is a parallel process. Its purpose is to review the suitability of certain sites for future urban development. While this site is not identified there is nothing fundamental within the Review, identifying why the proposal could not proceed. 		

- Bushfire impacts were presented as follows:
 - All transects around the area proposed to be rezoned are under 18% based on recent survey. BlackAsh’s findings to the contrary were based on contour data and not verified survey data.
 - NSW RFS held limited discussions with the proponent regarding technical bushfire aspects of the Planning Proposal.
 - The hazard is principally the result of low heath, tall heath and woodland vegetation, which is contested by the NSW RFS, which considers it to be forest vegetation.
 - The subdivision will occur under community title with money be used to manage the Asset Protection Zone (APZ).
 - The subdivision would provide two, subsequently presented as three access/egress routes – Elm Avenue, Ralston Avenue and Wyatt Avenue. Commission panel members queried the third route, which is a ‘fork’ on the second route rather than a route of itself.
 - Recognised that fire could reach the site quickly but argued that Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006 (PFBP) provides standards to build safely in bushfire zones without loss of life and property.
 - Ridgetop developments, with appropriate protections, are acceptable and have occurred in other areas.
 - APZs in the Planning Proposal will reduce risk to existing subdivisions, which were built prior to PFBP.
 - Risk to the substation will also be reduced as a result of the APZ’s and proposed development, which will create a buffer for the substation.
 - The Planning Proposal is consistent with all facets of the relevant bushfire policies and s117 directions.
 - Access roads do not create a pinch point. Access can be managed through the multiple access/egress routes in the event of an emergency.
 - Arcing of electricity from the power lines is not likely to occur and has been misrepresented by BlackAsh and Council. It is not a significant issue.
- The Planning Proposal will retain 119ha of E3 zoned land adjoining National Park land.
- The proponent has extensively mapped the vegetation on the site and found that the Planning Proposal will not result in any biodiversity loss or species loss.
- The Planning Proposal will result in a better conservation outcome as it will result in more active management of the site.

Documents: PowerPoint presentation to the Commission.

Outcomes/Agreed Actions: The proponent to provide to the Commission the relevant survey data and a document comparing the differences between the BlackAsh bushfire report and the proponent’s bushfire findings.

Meeting closed at 11:15am