

I certify that this copy of the Minutes is a true and correct record of the meeting held on 5th April 2011
Signed:
Presiding Elected Member
Date:.....



**MINUTES OF SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS ON
TUESDAY, 5 APRIL 2011
COMMENCING AT 5.25PM**

PRESENT:	President	Cr S C Chandler (Presiding Member)
	Councillors	Cr R T McClurg (Deputy President) Cr J B Fitzhardinge Cr K J Hepworth Cr B C Scott Cr I F West Cr L W Wheeler
	Staff	Mr D J Simmons – Chief Executive Officer Mr G M Peddie – Director, Corporate Services (Minute Taker) Mr F A Neuweiler – Manager, Community Development Mr G F Coaker – Town Planner Mr A S Wootton – Works Manager
APOLOGIES:		Cr R W Roberts

-
- 1. DECLARATION OF OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS**
The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 5.25pm and welcomed all those in attendance to the proceedings.
 - 2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE**
Cr R W Roberts - Apology
 - 3. REPORTS**

TP.512
Subject: Dongara to Cape Burney Coastal Planning Policy
Proponent: Department of Planning
Reporting Officer: Town Planner
File Reference: LP.PR.2
Date Prepared: 31 March 2011
Voting Requirements: Simple Majority

Issue:

To consider two options for the proposed Dongara to Cape Burney Coastal Planning Policy as provided by the Department of Planning.

Background:

The Shire, along with the City of Geraldton-Greenough, have been involved in assisting the Department of Planning's coastal branch prepare a planning strategy for the coast between Dongara and the Greenough River mouth since 2008.

That process culminated in a Steering Committee meeting held in November of last year whereby a first draft was presented for discussion. At the conclusion of that meeting, and on advice from the Department of Planning, it was expected that such draft would be advertised in February or March of this year.

However, on the 1st of February of this year, team members from the Central Regions within the Department of Planning met with the Shire and advised that the first draft was not suitable and that the Central Regions would be taking carriage of the project and would provide a revised draft.

Subject Land:

The study area within the Shire for this policy covers the same land as Policy Area E of the Shire's Local Planning Strategy. This being the land bounded by Francisco Road, Brand Highway, Wakeford Road and the Indian Ocean. Within the City, the study area covers a similar extent northwards to Cape Burney at the Greenough River mouth.

The land is currently zoned "General Farming" under the Shire's Local Planning Scheme No 5.

The Proposal:

Subsequent to their internal changes, the Department of Planning have now referred two options (for what is now to be known as the Dongara to Cape Burney Coastal Planning Policy) to the Shire and the City for comment.

The Department has requested comments be returned as soon as possible in order to allow the policy to be considered by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) at its April meeting.

Copies of the two options have been provided under separate cover.

Essentially, Option 1 provides a strategy for allowing and controlling some development. It includes the following main elements:

- an area for short term and long term townsite expansion adjoining the current Dongara urban area (Precinct 1A and 1B);
- provision for rural smallholdings lots;
- provision for conservation lots;
- potential for tourism development; and
- provision of a foreshore reserve and public access at certain location on the coast.

Option 2 essentially precludes any further subdivision or development of the study area, other than for the same urban expansion precinct as included in Option 1.

Officers Comment:

Option 2 is basically designed to restrict any further subdivision, other than for urban purposes close to town. It is assumed that this is in response to the WAPC's current revision of its statewide

policies on rural land use planning which advocate rural land either be set aside for urban expansion or used for agricultural purposes, not rural lifestyle lots. This is less of an option for the following reasons:

- It would mean that the current “General Farming” zone would remain over the bulk of the strategy area, which is inappropriate on the basis that only limited agricultural operations are being conducted in this area at the moment, it would not recognise the area’s desirability for coastal recreation and it would not differentiate between the vegetated dunes and the cleared plain.
- One of the Shire’s original objectives for the strategy was to allow some subdivision on the basis this would be used as a mechanism to provide and formalise public access from the highway to the coast.
- The Shire’s current Local Planning Strategy already includes provisions to allow rezoning to Rural Smallholdings (albeit in conjunction with a tourism development). Landowners have bought land under the impression the land can be developed and it would be counter-productive to now remove that.

Option 1 is more in line with the envisaged strategy. However, it appears to need more clarification and explanation as to how it works. The following issues have been noted:

- Precinct 1 as it currently stands has the potential to result in urban sprawl. There needs to be some guidance as to how residential development would progress and ensure it doesn’t detract from or place pressure on the existing urban area.
- The provisions for development over the dunes are not clear. The policy needs to clarify if conservation lots are to be created under a new “Conservation Zone” for Irwin or if they can be addressed by adding conservation clauses to the existing rural smallholdings zone. It also needs to clarify how the 15ha minimum lot size applies in Irwin in response to the proposed averaging provision.
- The policy needs to provide a realistic scenario for how rural living lots would be provided with water. It may not be realistic to expect each new rural living lot to be developed with 450m² of roof catchment.
- The extent of each landform in the land use tables needs to be clearly identified.
- The purpose of the Development Investigation Areas needs to be clarified in terms of exactly where and who would do the investigation and how this differs from the potential for tourism development throughout the remainder of the precincts.

Despite the above, Option 1 generally represents a better opportunity to achieve a coastal planning strategy that takes a realistic view of the current pressures on the study area and how best to manage these. It is envisaged that the above issues can be resolved.

It is noted however, in regards to Precinct 1 in both options, that there does not appear to be any current need for short term urban expansion over this land. Based on current population growth figures, new home building approvals and existing land available for residential development, the current urban area has enough capacity to provide for the next 15 to 20 years of residential growth, without including the land to the south of Port Denison which is constrained by lime sand mining operations.

The Department of Planning has been made aware of this on a number of occasions, however, the consistent view of the Department has been to ensure the area covered by Precinct 1 is available for both short term and long term urban expansion.

With this in mind, it may be of more benefit for the Shire to focus attention on ensuring provisions are included in the coastal policy to allow the Shire to manage urban expansion in this area, rather than rejecting urban development outright, which the Department is unlikely to support.

Therefore based on the revised draft options provided by the Department of Planning and the time constraints placed on the Shire to consider these options, the suggested approach is to adopt a position that the Shire is generally in support of Option 1, however, will take the opportunity during

the formal public advertising period to make a more detailed submission on the areas the Shire feels needs to be addressed or further clarified as part of this option.

This would ensure that the Shire is not responsible for further delaying the progress of the coastal policy, while still providing an opportunity to have more detailed input into its eventual provisions.

Following Council resolving its position on the new coastal policy (and the City of Geraldton-Greenough doing the same), the policy will be reported to the WAPC whereby it is expected that it will be given consent to advertise. Advertising will likely be for a period of 42 days, as advised by the Department of Planning.

Financial Implications:

Nil.

Policy Implications:

Adoption of a preliminary position on a northern coastal land use planning policy.

Officers Recommendation:

That Council resolves to advise the Western Australian Planning Commission that in relation to the options for the Dongara to Cape Burney Coastal Planning Policy as provided by the Department of Planning, that it generally endorses Option 1, subject to the Shire being given the opportunity to make a more detailed submission on this option during the public advertising period.

COUNCIL MOTION:

MOVED: Cr J B Fitzhardinge

SECONDED: Cr K J Hepworth

That Council resolves to advise the Western Australian Planning Commission that in relation to the options for the Dongara to Cape Burney Coastal Planning Policy as provided by the Department of Planning, that it generally endorses Option 1, subject to the Shire being given the opportunity to make a more detailed submission on this option during the public advertising period.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

VOTING DETAILS

7/0

4. CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 5.26pm.

I certify that this copy of the Minutes is a true and correct record of the meeting held on
5th April 2011

Signed:
Presiding Elected Member

Date:.....