

|  |
|--|
| <b>MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CLARENCE CITY COUNCIL<br/>HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, BLIGH STREET, ROSNY PARK, ON<br/>WEDNESDAY 26 AUGUST 2020</b> |
|--|

**HOURL CALLED:** 7.00pm

**PRESENT:** The meeting commenced at pm with the Mayor (Ald D C Chipman) in the Chair and with Aldermen:

B A Blomeley  
H Chong  
L Edmunds  
D Ewington  
R H James  
T Mulder  
J Peers  
S von Bertouch  
J Walker  
B Warren; present.

**1. APOLOGIES** W Kennedy

**ORDER OF BUSINESS** Items 1 – 13

**IN ATTENDANCE** General Manager  
(Mr I Nelson)  
  
Group Manager Engineering Services  
(Mr R Graham)  
  
Manager City Planning  
(Mr R Lovell)  
  
Strategic Planner  
(Mr D Ford)  
  
Executive Officer to the General Manager  
(Ms J Ellis)

The Meeting closed at 10.15pm.

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, the Mayor made the following declaration:

*“I acknowledge the Tasmanian Aboriginal Community as the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today, and pay respect to elders, past and present”.*

The Mayor also advised the Meeting and members of the public that Council Meetings, not including Closed Meeting, are audio-visually recorded and published to Council’s website.

**SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING  
WEDNESDAY 26 AUGUST 2020**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| <b>ITEM</b> | <b>SUBJECT</b>   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|-------------|--|-------------|
| 1.          | ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES .....   | 3           |
| 2.          | DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS OF ALDERMAN OR CLOSE ASSOCIATE .....                                       | 3           |
| 3.          | DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.....  | 4           |
| <b>4.</b>   | <b>PLANNING AUTHORITY MATTER</b>   |             |
| 4.1         | DRAFT CLARENCE LOCAL PROVISIONS SCHEDULE – SECTION 35F REPORT, CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS..... | 7           |

## **1. ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES**

Refer to cover page.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS OF ALDERMAN OR CLOSE ASSOCIATE**

(File No)

In accordance with Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 and Council's adopted Code of Conduct, the Mayor requests Aldermen to indicate whether they have, or are likely to have a pecuniary interest (any pecuniary benefits or pecuniary detriment) or conflict of interest in the item on the Agenda.

**INTEREST DECLARED:**            **NIL**

**3. DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

(File No 10/03/04)

In accordance with Regulation 38 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 and in accordance with Council Policy, deputation requests are invited to address the Meeting (as no public attendance is possible due to COVID-19 restrictions these will be read out by the General Manager).

Due to the number of submissions received, With the Leave of the Meeting, the General Manager provided a summary of each as follows:

**Deputation No 1 – Malcolm Purcell**

Representing the Oak Tree Group in Tasmania and the owners of 476/478 South Arm Lauderdale.

**Issue:** Lauderdale Rural Living Zone Rezoning

Oak Tree and the current landowners fully support council with the inclusion of the rural lot that is part of 476/478 South Arm Road to be included in the recommendation to the Minister for the changes to the Urban Growth Boundary.

**Deputation No 2 - Chris and Sue Johnston**

**Issue:** Lindisfarne Ridge Rural Living Zone Rezoning

Support for rezoning to Low Density Residential.

**Deputation No 3 - Frances Beasley**

On behalf of clients of era planning and environment - Representation number 81

**Issue:** 450 Rokeby Road Rezoning

Does not support the proposed Rural zoning of their clients' land at 450 Rokeby Road, Howrah. Proposes that the land be zoned General Residential.

**Deputation No 4 - Quentin Villanueva (Capital Investments)**

Representing Dourias Family Trust, Lambrakis Family Trust and In the Pipeline Pty Ltd

**Issue:** Rezoning of Central Lauderdale

Support for the rezoning of central Lauderdale to “future urban” – similar to the original status it had under the original Clarence City Council planning scheme where it was zoned “reserved urban”.

**Deputation No 5 - Jonathan Blood loci architecture + planning**

**Issue:** Zoning of 469 Rokeby Road

Requests support to modify the draft LPS to consolidate zoning at 469 Rokeby Road, to reflect the long-standing existing use of that site.

**Deputation No 6 - John Cleary**

**Issue:** Lindisfarne Ridge Rural Living Zone/Flagstaff Gully Rezoning

Support for rezoning to Low Density Residential.

**Deputation No 7 - Sam and Rachel Sammut**

**Issue:** Lindisfarne Ridge Rural Living Zone/Flagstaff Gully Rezoning

Support for rezoning to Low Density Residential.

**Deputation No 8 - Alex Brownlie (GHD)**

Representing Dourias Family Trust, Lambrakis Family Trust and In the Pipeline Pty Ltd

**Issue:** Rezoning of Central Lauderdale

Support for the rezoning of central Lauderdale to “future urban”.

**Deputation No 9 - Alison Dunn and Gerry Kregor**

**Issue:** Lindisfarne Ridge Rural Living Zone/Flagstaff Gully Rezoning (Representation 83)

Support for rezoning to Low Density Residential.

**Deputation No 10 – Susanne Hovington**

**Issue:**

- Rezoning the land at 424 South Arm Road, Lauderdale and 25 Acton Road Acton Park from Rural Living to Community Purpose;
- 4 & 6 Ringwood Road;
- 26 Mannata Street;
- 514 & 526 South Arm Road;
- 16 & 36 North Terrace, Lauderdale.

The General Manager advised that a copy of every submission was emailed to Aldermen prior to the meeting and a hard copy provided at the meeting.

**4. PLANNING AUTHORITY MATTER**

In accordance with Regulation 25 (1) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, the Mayor advises that the Council intends to act as a Planning Authority under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, to deal with the following item:

**4.1 DRAFT CLARENCE LOCAL PROVISIONS SCHEDULE – SECTION 35F REPORT, CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS**  
(File No AMEND-2020/006428)**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to review the representations received following exhibition of the draft Clarence Local Provision Schedule (LPS) and provide recommendations to the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) pursuant to Section 35F of the Land Use Planning and Approval Act 1993 (LUPAA).

**RELATION TO PLANNING PROVISIONS**

The LPS makes up the local component of the future Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS). When the Clarence LPS is ultimately approved by the TPC, the TPS will replace the current Clarence Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (CIPS2015).

**LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

The report on this item details the basis and reasons for the recommendation. Any alternative decision by Council will require a full statement of reasons in order to maintain the integrity of the Planning approval process and to comply with the requirements of the Judicial Review Act and the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

**CONSULTATION**

The draft LPS was exhibited in accordance with the statutory requirements as directed by the TPC from 15 January 2020 – 17 March 2020 and is the subject of this report.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- A. That in relation to the draft LPS, pursuant to Section 35F(2)(a) and (b) of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, Council resolves to:
  - (i) provide the Tasmanian Planning Commission with a copy of each representation made before the end of the exhibition period;
  - (ii) provide the Tasmanian Planning Commission with a copy of each representation made after the end of the exhibition period;
  - (iii) treat all representations made after the end of the exhibition period referred to in (ii) above as valid submissions and consider them in conjunction with the other representations.
- B. That pursuant to Section 35F(2)(c) and (e) of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act, Council resolves to endorse the attachment to this associated report “*Draft Clarence LPS Summary of Representations*” and associated recommendations and provide a copy to the Tasmanian Planning Commission.
- C. That Council resolves that it is satisfied that the draft LPS and associated recommendations outlined in the ‘Draft Clarence LPS Summary of Representations’ meets the LPS criteria prescribed at Section 34 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993.



- D. That the details and conclusions included in the Associated Report be recorded as the reasons for Council’s decision in respect of this matter.

**Decision:** **MOVED** Ald Walker **SECONDED** Ald Chong

- “A. That in relation to the draft LPS, pursuant to Section 35F(2)(a) and (b) of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, Council resolves to:
- (i) provide the Tasmanian Planning Commission with a copy of each representation made before the end of the exhibition period;
  - (ii) provide the Tasmanian Planning Commission with a copy of each representation made after the end of the exhibition period;
  - (iii) treat all representations made after the end of the exhibition period referred to in (ii) above as valid submissions and consider them in conjunction with the other representations.
- B. That pursuant to Section 35F(2)(c) and (e) of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act, Council resolves to endorse the attachment to the associated report “*Draft Clarence LPS Summary of Representations*” and associated recommendations incorporating the following amendments [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11(2), 12 and 13], and provide a copy to the Tasmanian Planning Commission.

**MOVED** Ald James **SECONDED** Ald Mulder

| <b>Amendment 1.</b>  |          |   |
|--|----------|---|
| Rep No.  | Page No. | Concern/Issue:                                      |
| 1, 46, 50, 55, 63, 86, 87 & 95   | 3 - 6    | <b>Rural Living Lot Size (Acton Park/Cambridge)</b> |
| <b>Replacement Recommendation</b>  |          |   |
| Rezone the Rural Living area B (2Ha) zoned land in the Cambridge/Acton corridor to area A (1Ha). |          |   |

#### **Reasons**

The purpose of modifying the zoning for the suburbs of Acton Park and Cambridge is to set a minimum lot size of 1 ha. This is justified as follows:

- a. In response to the issues raised and merits of representation numbers 1, 46, 50, 55, 63, 86, 87 and 95
- b. There are no natural justice conflicts in the change because:
  - i. it will allow landowners to subdivide their blocks and maintain smaller holdings that will be more affordable for people looking to move to the area;

- ii. subdivision of the blocks will create natural justice for those who, unlike many of their neighbours, were not able to subdivide prior to the 2007 scheme coming into force at short notice.
- c. Is in accordance with section 32 because there is little practical difference between 1 and 2 hectare lot sizes in this topography and more than three quarters of the lots in Acton are already smaller than 2 hectares.
- d. Furthers the Objective set out in Schedule 1 because the change would free up additional lots quickly without the need to provide additional infrastructure to address the current housing shortage and:
  - i. provides for fair use by enabling neighbours to have similar sized lots – (Objective 1(b));
  - ii. by heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management - (Objective 1(c));
  - iii. facilitates economic development – (Objective 1 (d));
  - iv. by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government -, (Objective 1I).
- e. Is consistent with each State policy because 1HA minimum lot sizes would not impact threatened vegetation communities. Water Quality can be managed through installation of reticulated services.
- f. Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because there is scope within STRLUS to reduce the minimum Rural Living Zone lot size from 2 hectare down to 1 hectare. SRD 1.4 refers to increased densities in Rural Living areas to an average of 1 dwelling per hectare:
  - i. is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because 2Ha lot sizes do not recognise the existing settlement pattern and earlier schemes (RPDC DR9) had a density rating 1 lot per hectare for the entire Acton Corridor and the Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because, under RLZ4;
    - i. the area is not targeted for future greenfields urban development;
    - ii. landscape values can be protected through the application of relevant codes;
    - iii. it is land that is not suitable for agricultural use.
- g. The modification will have only minor impact on the implementation of the LPS as a whole because the Rural Living Zone remains and the change is limited to conversion from Rural Living B to Rural Living A.

**CARRIED****FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
 Ald Chipman  
 Ald Chong  
 Ald Edmunds  
 Ald Ewington  
 Ald James  
 Ald Mulder  
 Ald Peers  
 Ald Walker  
 Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald von Bertouch

**MOVED** Ald Mulder **SECONDED** Ald Ewington

| <b>Amendment 2.</b>   |            |   |
|---|------------|---|
| Rep No.   | Page No.   | Concern/Issue:                          |
| 66, 78, 98  | 7, 8 & 102 | <b>Rural Living Lot Size (Sandford)</b> |
| <b>Replacement Recommendation</b>   |            |   |
| Rezone the Rural Living area B (2Ha) zoned land in Sandford to area A (1Ha).  |            |   |
| <b>Reasons</b>  |            |   |
| <p>The purpose of modifying the zoning for the suburb of Sandford is to set a minimum lot size of 1 ha. This is justified as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to the issues raised in, and the merits of, representation numbers 66, 78 and 98.</li> <li>A natural justice conflicts arises because not all landowners have been consulted and their views are not known, meaning that the proposal would need to be re-advertised and/or other owners directly consulted on the change.</li> <li>Is in accordance with <u>section 32</u> because the rezoning will be limited to a local provision that can be considered under the TPS framework in that it is applying only Zones, Codes or SSQ format controls etc contained in the SPPs.</li> <li>Furtheres the Objectives set out in <u>Schedule 1</u> and provides for fair use by enabling neighbours to have similar sized lots - (Objective 1(b)) and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management – (Objective 1(c));</li> <li>facilitates economic development - (Objective 1 (d));</li> <li>by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government -, (Objective 1I.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is consistent with each State policy, in particular STRLUS which at SRD 1.4 provides for increase densities in Rural Living areas to an average of one dwelling per hectare where site conditions allow.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because, under RLZ4: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the area is not targeted for future greenfields urban development;</li> <li>because landscape values can be protected through the application of relevant codes;</li> <li>it is land that is not suitable for agricultural use.</li> </ol> </li> <li>The modification will have an impact on the implementation of the LDS as a whole as other landowners have not been advised of the proposed change.</li> </ol> |            |   |

**CARRIED****FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald Walker

**AGAINST**

Ald Chipman  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Warren

**MOVED** Ald James **SECONDED** Ald Ewington

| <b>Amendment 3.</b>  |          |  |
|--|----------|--|
| Rep No.  | Page No. | Concern/Issue:                               |
| 4, 48, 68 & 83   | 19 - 22  | <b>Lindisfarne Ridge – Rural Living Zone</b> |
| <b>Replacement Recommendation</b>  |          |  |
| With the exception of 16 Kent St which should be zoned General Residential, rezone the Rural Living area B (2Ha) zoned land in Lindisfarne to Low Density Residential.   |          |  |
| <b>Reasons</b>   |          |  |
| <p>The purpose of modifying the zone of the Lindisfarne Ridge to Low Density Residential is to set a minimum lot size of 1500m<sup>2</sup> (Acceptable Solution) or 1200m<sup>2</sup> (Performance Criteria). This is justified as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to the issues raised and merits of representation number 4, 48, 68 and 83.</li> <li>There are no natural justice conflicts in the change because no other party will be denied natural justice as the immediate landowners support applying the Low Density Residential zone.</li> <li>Is in accordance with <u>section 32</u> because all the lots have sizes more consistent with higher density zones, are subminimal and not within a rural setting.</li> <li>Is consistent with each State policy because most are inapplicable while Water Quality and Management can be addressed through installation of reticulated services and conditions as appropriate.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because the land is contained within the Urban Growth Boundary.</li> <li>Further the Objective set out in <u>Schedule 1</u> because the subject land is part of suburbia with access to all services with likely easy access to public transport. In a strategic sense this land ought not remain underutilised. The proposal also furthers Schedule 1 Objectives by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management – (Objective 1(c));</li> <li>facilitating economic development - (Objective 1 (d));</li> <li>heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government -, (Objective 1(e)).</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is consistent with each State policy because the subject land is part of suburbia and has access to all services and is within easy commuting distance of the Hobart CBD. The land is not within a rural setting and not consistent with the purpose of the Rural Living Zone.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because the subject properties are within the identified STRLUS UGB and developed for urban purposes. The STRLUS identifies strategies supporting the need to rezone the land to higher densities close to the main urban extent of Greater Hobart.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because the subject land is within the STRLUS UGB and is designated as an area of densification and is not within a rural setting and therefore inconsistent with the purpose of the Rural Living Zone.</li> </ol> |          |  |

- j. The modification is consistent with Council having adopted for an incremental approach to the conversion over the years by the rezoning of Jove Court, Radiata Drive, 13 Kent Street from Rural Residential to Low Density Residential. This has resulted in lots in the Rural Living Zone having sizes more consistent with higher density zones.

**CARRIED**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker (abstained)

**MOVED** Ald Mulder **SECONDED** Ald Ewington**Amendment 4.**

| Rep No.        | Page No. | Concern/Issue:                      |
|----------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
| 4, 48, 68 & 83 | 22 - 24  | <b>Lindisfarne Ridge - LDR Zone</b> |

**Replacement Recommendation**

Rezone the Low Density Residential land from Flagstaff Gully extending along the Lindisfarne Ridge to Begonia St and including 1C Robin Court and 164 Begonia Street to General Residential.

**Reasons**

The purpose of modifying the land at Lindisfarne and Flagstaff Gully to General Residential (including 1C Robin Court and 164 Begonia Street) is to provide for future development of the site. This is justified as follows:

- a. In response to the issues raised and merits of representation numbers 4, 55, 68, 83.
- b. There are no natural justice conflicts in the change as all impacted landowners may not have been consulted on the proposed change.
- c. Is in accordance with [section 32](#) because the change will be limited to a local provision that can be considered under the TPS framework i.e. is it applying only Zones, Codes or SSQ format controls etc contained in the SPPs).
- d. Furthers the Objective set out in [Schedule 1](#) because the change would free up additional lots quickly without the need to provide additional infrastructure to address the current housing shortage and by:
  - i. heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management – (Objective 1(c));
  - ii. facilitating economic development - (Objective 1 (d));
  - iii. heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government – (Objective 1I).
- e. Is consistent with each State policy because most are inapplicable while Water Quality and Management can be addressed through installation of reticulated services and conditions as appropriate.
- f. Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because the land is contained within the Urban Growth Boundary.
- g. Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application and is consistent with neighbouring residential areas and:
  - i. is or can be connected to reticulated water and sewerage (GRZ1(b));
  - ii. is not highly constrained by hazards or natural values or other impediments and any issues can be taken into account with appropriate management plans (GRZ3).
- h. The modification will have a low impact on the implementation of the LPS as all landowners may not have been consulted on the proposed change.

The Mayor asked the Deputy Mayor to **assume** the Chair while he entered the debate as an Alderman (7.57pm).

The Mayor **resumed** the Chair at 7.59pm.

The **MOTION** was **put** and **CARRIED**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley

Ald Chong

Ald Edmunds

Ald Ewington

Ald James

Ald Mulder

Ald Peers

Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald Chipman

Ald von Bertouch

Ald Walker (abstained)

**MOVED** Ald Mulder **SECONDED** Ald James**Amendment 5.**

| Rep No. | Page No. | Concern/Issue:                                     |
|---------|----------|--|
| 71      | 9 - 10   | <b>Rural Living Lot Size (Geilston Bay/Risdon)</b> |

**Replacement Recommendation**

Rezone the Rural Living area B (2Ha) zoned land at Geilston Bay/Risdon to area A (1Ha).

**Reasons**

The purpose of modifying the area of land around Pipers Road is to set a minimum lot size of 1 ha. This is justified as follows:

- a. In response to the issues raised in, and the merits of, representation number 71.
- b. A natural justice conflicts arises because not all landowners have been consulted and their views are not known, meaning that the proposal may have to be re-advertised and/or other owners directly consulted on the change.
- c. Is in accordance with section 32 because the rezoning will be limited to a local provision that can be considered under the TPS framework in that it is applying only Zones, Codes or SSQ format controls etc contained in the SPPs.
- d. Furthers the Objectives set out in Schedule 1 because:
  - i. the change would free up additional lots quickly without the need to provide additional infrastructure to address the current housing shortage;
  - ii. provides for fair use by enabling neighbours to have similar sized lots – (Objective 1(b));
  - iii. by heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management - (Objective 1(c));
  - iv. facilitates economic development – (Objective 1 (d));
  - v. by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government -, (Objective 1I).
- e. Is consistent with each State policy, in particular STRLUS which, at SRD 1.4, provides for increase densities in Rural Living areas to an average of one dwelling per hectare where site conditions allow.
- f. Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because, under RLZ4:
  - i. the area is not targeted for future greenfield urban development;
  - ii. landscape values can be protected through the application of relevant codes;
  - iii. is land that is not suitable for agricultural use.



- g. The modification will have an impact on the implementation of the LDS as a whole as other landowners have not been advised of the proposed change.

**CARRIED**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald von Bertouch

**MOVED Ald Mulder SECONDED Ald Blomeley**

| <b>Amendment 6.</b>  |          |   |
|--|----------|---|
| Rep No.  | Page No. | Concern/Issue:  |
| 21   | 40 - 41  | <b>Rezoning: 424 South Arm Road, Lauderdale and 25 Acton Road, Acton Park</b> |
| <b>Replacement Recommendation</b>  |          |   |
| Rezone the land at 424 South Arm Road, Lauderdale and 25 Acton Road, Acton Park from Rural Living to Community Purpose.  |          |   |
| <b>Reasons</b>   |          |   |
| <p>The purpose of modifying the zoning for 424 South Arm Road Lauderdale and 25 Acton Road Acton Park to Community Purpose is to conform to the neighbouring property zones of Community Living (Lauderdale school) and Commercial. This is justified as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to the issues raised and merits of representations numbered 21.</li> <li>There are no natural justice conflicts in the change because all landowners and adjacent landowners have been consulted on the proposed change. There is an equity issue as the neighbouring lots are zoned commercial and community purpose, placing these lots at odds with the immediate area.</li> <li>The change satisfies section 32 because it will be limited to a local provision that can be considered under the TPS framework i.e. applying only Zones, Codes or SSQ format controls etc contained in the SPPs): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>further the objectives set out in Schedule 1 by heeding the representations, encouraging public involvement in land use and management – (Objective 1(c));</li> <li>facilitates economic development - (Objective 1 (d));</li> <li>by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government - (Objective 1(e)).</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is consistent with applicable State policy because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Coastal Policy 1996 – the proposal aligns this land with other nearby areas and the proposed Rural Living zone is incongruous with the zoning and use of adjacent land;</li> <li>Water Quality Management Policy 1997 in that the area is already connected to reticulated water and sewerage systems and is not within the Lauderdale inundation zone.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because surrounding properties are zoned Commercial and Community Purpose that would enable development of the land consistent with adjacent uses.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the area is connected to reticulated and water supply and sewerage systems (GRZ1(b));</li> <li>the Community Purpose Zone is appropriate as the area is adjacent to a Community Purpose use (school) and Commercial Zone (nursery/future supermarket);</li> <li>the land is not constrained by natural hazards and other impediments.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> |          |   |

- g. The modification will have no impact on the implementation of the LPS as the landowner is supportive of the change.

**CARRIED**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald von Bertouch

**MOVED** Ald James **SECONDED** Ald Ewington**Amendment 7.**

| Rep No.     | Page No. | Concern/Issue:                           |
|-------------|----------|--|
| 17, 47 & 85 | 33 - 37  | <b>Lauderdale Rural Living Rezoning.</b> |

**Replacement Recommendation**

With exception of the land at 424 South Arm Road, Lauderdale and 25 Acton Road, Acton Park which should be zoned Community Purpose, rezone the Rural Living land in Lauderdale zoned to Future Urban.

**Reasons**

The purpose of modifying the zoning of rural living land within Lauderdale (excluding 424 South Arm Rd and 25 Acton Road) the Lauderdale is to provide for future Lauderdale expansion. This is justified as follows:

- a. In response to the issues raised and merits of representation number 17, 47 and 85.
- b. There are no natural justice conflicts in the change because submissions to the JMG Feasibility Study opposing the proposal are no longer relevant and should not be relied upon for future decision making. Recent LPS supportive submissions received on behalf of three (3) parties requested the properties at 4 & 6 Ringwood Road, 26 and 53 Ringwood Road and 476 and 488 South Arm Road be rezoned to Future Urban.
- c. Is in accordance with [section 32](#) because information around land capability suggests a more appropriate zoning can be applied in the LPS such as the Future Urban Zone.
- d. Furthers the Objectives set out in [Schedule 1](#) because the site is well serviced with both civil/social infrastructure and public open space. Cultural heritage values exist on the sites but not a constraint to development. The Objective set out in [Schedule 1](#) are also furthered:
  - i. by heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management – (Objective 1(c));
  - ii. facilitates economic development - (Objective 1 (d));
  - iii. by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government - (Objective 1(e)).
- e. Is consistent with each State policy:
  - i. State Coastal Policy 1996 – the proposal aligns this land with other nearby areas and the existing Rural Living zone is incongruous with the zoning of adjacent land;
  - ii. Water Quality Management Policy 1997 in that the area is already connected to reticulated water and sewerage systems and that inundation and inundation and, and flooding can be managed through appropriate condition and engineering solutions that have already been determined to be feasible and sustainable;
  - iii. pressure to rezone the subject area to provide for future growth has been the subject of many Council decisions including the development of the CPS, the CIPS 2015 and the JMG Feasibility Study for potential urban expansion of Lauderdale. The studies detailed analysis concluded;
    1. the project can be engineered to work sustainably;

2. the site is well serviced with both civil/social infrastructure is consistent with applicable State policy because.
- f. Is it consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy, noting that a recent TPC decision relating to Draft Amendment PSA 2018-3 and permit DAS-2018 to the Kingborough Planning Scheme (December 2019) suggests that although the STRLUS has been a useful document it should not be relied upon for future decision making, and
    - i. surrounding properties are zoned Residential (natural justice and fairness) and zoning as ‘Future Urban’ would enable development of the land within a future Urban Growth Boundary extension, subject to a revised structure plan;
    - ii. the modification suggests the Lauderdale Structure Plan (LSP) was informed by perceived capacity and land constraints. The representor (GHD) submits the information on which the feasibility report was based is critically out of date in terms of population predictions, housing supply and the availability of nearby services.
  - g. Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because:
    - i. the area is connected to reticulated and water supply and sewerage systems (GRZ1(b));
    - ii. the Future Urban Zone is appropriate as the area is surrounded by urban land and an updated structure plan will be used to guide future development (Note to GRZ2);
    - iii. the land is partially constrained by natural hazards and other impediments, but these can be taken into account with appropriate management during the future rezoning process and an updated Structure plan.
  - h. The modification will impact on the implementation of the LPS as a whole as the recommended change will require further community consultation.

The Mayor asked the Deputy Mayor to **assume** the Chair while he entered the debate as an Alderman (8.35pm)

The Mayor **resumed** the Chair at 8.38pm

The **MOTION** was **put** and **LOST**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder

**AGAINST**

Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Peers  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**MOVED** Ald James **SECONDED** Ald Ewington

| <b>Amendment 8.</b>   |          |   |
|---|----------|---|
| Rep No.   | Page No. | Concern/Issue:  |
| 23  | 41 - 42  | <b>SSQ for Community Living (476 and 488 South Arm Hwy)</b> |
| <b>Replacement Recommendation</b>   |          |   |
| Insert a new Site-Specific Qualification to provide for Community Living as a discretionary use at 476 and 488 South Arm Hwy.   |          |   |
| <b>Reasons</b>  |          |   |
| <p>The purpose of modifying the zoning for 476 and 488 South Arm Road Lauderdale is to enable the development of a retirement living within the context of a Site-Specific Qualification. This is justified as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to the issues raised and merits of representations numbered 23.</li> <li>There are natural justice conflicts in the change because not all adjacent landowners have been consulted on the proposed change.</li> <li>The change satisfies section 32 because it will be limited to a local provision that can be considered under the TPS framework i.e. is it applying only Zones, Codes or SSQ format controls etc contained in the SPPs.</li> <li>Furtheres the Objectives set out in <a href="#">Schedule 1</a>: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management – (Objective 1(c));</li> <li>facilitates economic development - (Objective 1 (d));</li> <li>by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government - (Objective 1(e)).</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is consistent with applicable State policy because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Coastal Policy 1996 – the proposal aligns this land with other nearby areas and the proposed Rural Living Zone is incongruous with the zoning of adjacent land;</li> <li>Water Quality Management Policy 1997 – the area is already connected to reticulated water and sewerage systems and that inundation and flooding can be managed through appropriate condition and engineering solutions that have already been determined to be feasible and sustainable.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because surrounding properties are zoned Residential and zoning as ‘Future Urban’ would enable development of the land within a future Urban Growth Boundary extension, subject to a revised structure plan.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the area is connected to reticulated and water supply and sewerage systems (GRZ1(b));</li> <li>an SSQ will facilitate development of a lifestyle village;</li> <li>the land is partially constrained by natural hazards and other impediments, but these can be taken into account with appropriate management during the future rezoning process and an updated Structure Plan.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> |          |   |

1. The modification will not impact on the implementation of the LPS as the recommended change will require further community consultation.

The **MOTION** was **put** and **LOST**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder

**AGAINST**

Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Peers  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**MOVED Ald Mulder SECONDED Ald Ewington**

| <b>Amendment 9.</b>  |          |   |
|--|----------|---|
| Rep No.  | Page No. | Concern/Issue:                                      |
| 8 & 54   | 25 - 26  | <b>Kadina Rd - Rural Living Zone &amp; lot size</b> |
| <b>Replacement Recommendation</b>  |          |   |
| Rezone the Rural land surrounding Kadina Road and fronting Richmond Road to Rural Living with a minimum 1Ha lot size (area A). |          |   |

**Reasons**

The purpose of modifying the zoning for the properties at Kadina Road and Richmond Road in Cambridge is create a minimum lot size of 1 ha. This is justified as follows

- a. In response to the issues raised in, and the merits of, representation numbers 8 and 54 and that Council planning officers recommend the land be rezoned Rural Living B.
- b. The rezoning of the land is unlikely to create natural justice issues as it would provide for limited additional subdivision potential and the lots already represent a rural residential settlement.
- c. Is in accordance with section 32 because the rezoning will be limited to a local provision that can be considered under the TPS framework in that it is applying only Zones, Codes or SSQ format controls etc contained in the SPPs.
- d. Furthers the Objectives set out in Schedule 1:
  - i. by heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management – (Objective 1(c));
  - ii. facilitates economic development - (Objective 1 (d));
  - iii. by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government - (Objective 1(e)).
- e. Is consistent with each State policy, in particular STRLUS which at SRD 1.4 provides for increase densities in Rural Living areas to an average of one dwelling per hectare where site conditions allow.
- f. Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because, under RLZ4:
  - i. the area is not targeted for future greenfields urban development;
  - ii. landscape values can be protected through the application of relevant codes;
  - iii. is land that is not suitable for agricultural use.
- g. The modification will have no impact on the implementation of the LDS as a whole as all landowners are supportive of the proposed change.

**CARRIED****FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
 Ald Chong  
 Ald Edmunds  
 Ald Ewington  
 Ald James  
 Ald Mulder  
 Ald Peers  
 Ald Walker  
 Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald von Bertouch  
 Ald Chipman (abstained)



**MOVED** Ald Warren **SECONDED** Ald Mulder**Amendment 10.**

| Rep No.                  | Page No. | Concern/Issue:                       |
|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|
| 2, 3, 10, 19,<br>31 & 51 | 16 - 18  | <b>Rosny Hill Rezoning &amp; SSQ</b> |

**Replacement Recommendation**

That the recommendation to create a Site-Specific Qualification (SSQ) for the Rosny Hill Nature Recreation Area (12A Akuna Street, Rosny) in addition to exhibited zone (Recreation) be rejected.

**Reasons**

The stated purpose of creating an SSQ for the Rosny Hill Nature Recreation Area, is to validate the approval given to the Rosny Hill Hotel Permit PDPLANPMTD-2019002428 which according to Council Planning Officers “could not have been approved under either of the SPP’s Open Space or Recreation Zones”. This refusal is justified as follows:

- a. In response to the issues raised and merits of representation numbers 2, 3, 10, 19, 31 and 51.
- b. There are no natural justice conflicts in the change because the only request for the creation of an SSQ has been submitted by the Clarence City Council.
- c. Is in accordance with [section 32](#) because it applies a zone contained in the SPPs.
- d. Furthers the Objectives set out in [Schedule 1](#) because the use of the Rosny Hill Recreation Area by the public for recreational and landcare activities has a significant benefit for the community and the environment.
- e. Is consistent with each State policy because it meets the Objective of the *Nature Conservation Act 2002* which include ‘(a) to conserve natural biological diversity’ and ‘(e) to encourage tourism, recreational use and enjoyment consistent with the conservation of the Nature Recreation Area’s natural and cultural values’.
- f. Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because it is consistent with the management and use of other hills in the Clarence Municipality.
- g. Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because it does not require a change of zone.
- h. The refusal of a new SSQ for the Rosny Hill Recreation Nature Reserve has no impact on the LPS as a whole.

The **MOTION** was **put** and **LOST**

**FOR**

Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald Peers  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker

**MOVED** Ald James **SECONDED** Ald Ewington

| <b>Amendment 11.</b>  |          |                                   |
|---|----------|-----------------------------------|
| Rep No.   | Page No. | Concern/Issue:                    |
| 81  | 42 - 43  | <b>450 Rokeby Road - Rezoning</b> |
| <b>Replacement Recommendation (1)</b>   |          |                                   |
| Rezone the land at 450 Rokeby Road, Howrah from Rural to General Residential and Open Space shown in representation 81.   |          |                                   |
| <b>Reasons</b>  |          |                                   |
| <p>The purpose of modifying the zoning of 450 Rokeby Road to General Residential and Open Space is to provide for future development of the site. This is justified as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response the issues raised and merits of representation number 81.</li> <li>There are no natural justice conflicts in the change because no other party will be denied natural justice by this change: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>however, natural justice (and fairness) is served in rezoning the land to General Residential as it is surrounded on two sides by General Residential land;</li> <li>the land is in close proximity to urban facilities and residential surroundings.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is in accordance with <u>section 32</u> because Rezoning of the land to General Residential complies with the relevant Guidelines and that the General Residential zone be applied across the western portion of the site.</li> <li>Furtheres the Objectives set out in <u>Schedule 1</u>: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management – (Objective 1(c));</li> <li>facilitates economic development - (Objective 1 (d));</li> <li>by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government - (Objective 1(e)).</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is consistent with each State policy because the historic quarry site has undergone extensive rehabilitation and remediation works and considered appropriate for the Open Space zone be applied to that portion of the site.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because the site is within the STRLUS UGB and fully serviced.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because the proposed Rural Zone prescribes a 40hectare minimum lot size and rezoning of the land to General Residential would be consistent with the relevant zone across the western portion of the site.</li> <li>The modification would provide 10-12 residential lots slightly larger than minimum lot size of 450m<sup>2</sup>. A public road abuts the property on the east and west boundaries with potential for a through connection joining Vienne Drive with Norfolk Drive.</li> <li>The modification will not impact on the implementation of the LDS as a whole as the landowner is supportive of the proposed change.</li> </ol> |          |                                   |

The Mayor asked the Deputy Mayor to **assume** the Chair while he entered the debate as an Alderman (9.35pm).

The Mayor **resumed** the Chair at 9.37pm.

The **MOTION** was **put** and **LOST**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers

**AGAINST**

Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**MOVED Ald Ewington SECONDED Ald Mulder**

| <b>Amendment 11.</b>   |                 |                                   |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Rep No.</b>   | <b>Page No.</b> | <b>Concern/Issue:</b>             |
| 81   | 42 - 43         | <b>450 Rokeby Road - Rezoning</b> |
| <b>Replacement Recommendation (2)</b>  |                 |                                   |
| Rezone the land at 450 Rokeby Road, Howrah from Rural to Future Urban in response to representation 81.  |                 |                                   |
| <p><b>Reasons</b></p> <p>The purpose of modifying the zoning of 450 Rokeby Road to Future Urban is to provide for future development of the site. This is justified as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response the issues raised and merits of representation number 81.</li> <li>There are no natural justice conflicts in the change because no other party will be denied natural justice by this change:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>however, natural justice (and fairness) is served in rezoning the land to Future Urban as it is surrounded on two sides by General Residential land;</li> <li>the land is in close proximity to urban facilities and residential surroundings.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is in accordance with <u>section 32</u> because future rezoning of the land to one of the residential zones complies with the relevant Guidelines for residential zones.</li> <li>Furtheres the Objectives set out in <u>Schedule 1</u>:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management - (Objective 1(c));</li> <li>facilitates economic development - (Objective 1 (d));</li> <li>by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government - (Objective 1(e)).</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is consistent with each State policy because the historic quarry site has undergone extensive rehabilitation and remediation works and considered appropriate for future development in line with other developments in disused quarry sites, notably the inner residential zone.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because the site is within the STRLUS UGB and fully serviced.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because the proposed Rural Zone prescribes a 40hectare minimum lot size and rezoning of the land to Future Urban would with neighbouring land.</li> <li>The modification would provide for intensified residential lots with access from public roads the east and west boundaries and a connection of Vienne Drive with Norfolk Drive rather than the existing access from Rokeby Road (South Arm Road).</li> </ol> |                 |                                   |

- i. The modification will not impact on the implementation of the LDS as a whole as the landowner is supportive of the proposed change.

**CARRIED**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald von Bertouch

**MOVED** Ald James **SECONDED** Ald Mulder

| <b>Amendment 12.</b>  |          |  |
|---|----------|--|
| Rep No.   | Page No. | Concern/Issue:                               |
| 58, 59 & 99   | 47 - 48  | <b>8 &amp; 14 Driftwood Drive - Rezoning</b> |
| <b>Replacement Recommendation</b>   |          |  |
| Rezone the land at 8 & 14 Driftwood Drive, Opossum Bay from Rural Living to Low Density Residential.  |          |  |
| <b>Reasons</b>  |          |  |
| <p>The purpose of modifying the zoning of 8 and 14 Driftwood Drive to Low Density Residential is to set a minimum lot size of 1500m<sup>2</sup> (Acceptable Solution) or 1200m<sup>2</sup> (Performance Criteria). This is justified as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to the issues raised and merits of representation number 58, 59 and 99.</li> <li>There are no natural justice conflicts in the change because every Rural living zoned lot within the area has been developed for residential purposes and no other party will be denied natural justice by this change.</li> <li>Is in accordance with <u>section 32</u> the change will be consistent with to the lots within the area including the subject lot have been developed for residential purposes.</li> <li>Further the Objective set out in <u>Schedule 1</u> because the LDR zone more appropriately reflects the existing development pattern and use of the land and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management – (Objective 1(c));</li> <li>facilitates economic development - (Objective 1 (d));</li> <li>by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government - (Objective 1(e)).</li> </ol> </li> <li>Is consistent with each State policy because the LDR zone would provide infill opportunities and development for residential purposes and more effective use of infrastructure and road frontage and in particular direct access for 14 Driftwood Drive.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because Lots 8 and 14 are all subminimum lots significantly below the 2.0Ha prescribed by the application of the Rural Living Area B proposed and therefore Rural Living zone users are incompatible with the character of the area.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because the properties at 8 Driftwood Drive and 14 Driftwood Drive are approximately 0.96Ha lot and 1.2Ha lot respectively. They are all subminimum lots significantly below the 2.0Ha contrary to that being proposed for inclusion in Rural Living Area B.</li> <li>The modification LDR zone should apply as the land is consistent with the proposed zone and existing development to the south and north and match existing lots to the adjoining LDR subdivision.</li> </ol> |          |  |

- i. The modification will not impact on the implementation of the LPS as the recommended change is supported by affected landowners.

**CARRIED**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker

**MOVED** Ald Ewington **SECONDED** Ald Peers

| <b>Amendment 13.</b>   |          |   |
|--|----------|---|
| Rep No.  | Page No. | Concern/Issue:  |
| 63   | 56 - 57  | <b>4 &amp; 6 Paige Court, Warrane – Dwelling Density / Zoning</b> |
| <b>Replacement Recommendation</b>  |          |   |
| Rezone the land at 4 & 6 Paige Court, Warrane to Inner Residential.  |          |   |
| <b>Reasons</b>   |          |   |
| <p>The purpose of modifying the zoning of 4 &amp; 6 Paige Crt Warrane is to increase the density and supply of housing in an area of need. This is justified as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to the issues raised and merits of representation number 63.</li> <li>There are no natural justice conflicts in the change because the proposed modification relates only to a single title and is consistent with the residential nature of surrounding properties.</li> <li>Is in accordance with <a href="#">section 32</a> because the change will be limited to a local provision that can be considered under the TPS framework i.e. is it applying only Zones, Codes or SSQ format controls etc contained in the SPPs).</li> <li>Further the Objectives set out in <a href="#">Schedule 1</a>: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by heeding the representations, encourages public involvement in land use and management – (Objective 1(c));</li> <li>facilitates economic development - (Objective 1 (d));</li> <li>by heeding local government perspectives, promotes sharing of responsibility between the different spheres of government - (Objective 1(e)).</li> </ol> </li> <li>State Policies on the Protection of Agricultural Land 2009 State Coastal Policy 1996 Water Quality Management 1997 are either not applicable or can be addressed through conditions.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy because this urban development is within the Urban Growth Boundary.</li> <li>Is consistent with the Guideline No.1 – Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) zone and code application because it conforms to the IRZ1 (Inner Residential Zone) in that the area is connected to existing infrastructure and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is characterised by higher density dwelling with greater presence of non-housing activity;</li> <li>is in proximity to activity centres at Bellerive, Rosny Park and Warrane;</li> <li>located near a high frequency corridor (Cambridge Road).</li> </ol> </li> </ol> |          |   |



- h. The modification will not impact on the implementation of the LPS as the recommended change affects only one landowner.

**CARRIED****FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald von Bertouch

- C. That Council resolves that it is satisfied that the draft LPS and associated recommendations outlined in the ‘Draft Clarence LPS Summary of Representations’ as amended in Part B above meets the LPS criteria prescribed at Section 34 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993.
- D. That the details and conclusions included in the Associated Report be recorded as the reasons for Council’s decision in respect of this matter”.

**CARRIED****FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald von Bertouch

**FURTHER MOTION**

**MOVED** Ald Mulder **SECONDED** Ald von Bertouch

“That Council’s appreciation be conveyed to Planning officers and in particular Mr Dan Ford for all their work in preparing the submission”.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

The Meeting closed at 10.15pm.