

**MINUTES OF ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING OF THE CESSNOCK CITY COUNCIL
HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS ON WEDNESDAY, 20 MARCH 2019, COMMENCING AT
6.30 PM**

PRESENT: His Worship the Mayor, Councillor R Pynsent (in the Chair) and Councillors Olsen, Doherty, Dunn, Fagg, Stapleford, Suvaal, Fitzgibbon, Gray, Burke, Sander and Lyons.

IN ATTENDANCE: General Manager
Director Planning and Environment
Director Corporate and Community Services
Director Works and Infrastructure
Development Services Manager
Human Resource Manager
Senior Media & Communication Officer
Corporate Governance Officer

APOLOGY:

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Burke
Seconded: Councillor Gray

795

RESOLVED that the apology tendered on behalf of Councillor Dagg, for unavoidable absence, be accepted and leave of absence granted.

Councillor Sander requested a Leave of Absence for the Council meeting on 3 April 2019.

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MINUTES:

MOTION

Moved: Councillor Sander
Seconded: Councillor Fitzgibbon

796

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 6 March 2019, as circulated, be taken as read and confirmed as a correct record.

FOR

AGAINST

Councillor Olsen
Councillor Doherty
Councillor Dunn
Councillor Fagg
Councillor Stapleford
Councillor Suvaal
Councillor Fitzgibbon
Councillor Gray
Councillor Burke
Councillor Sander
Councillor Lyons
Councillor Pynsent

Total (12)

Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST NO. DI4/2019

SUBJECT: DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

That Councillors now disclose any interests and reasons for declaring such interest in the matters under consideration by Council at this meeting.

WI13/2019 - Cessnock Stomp Festival - In-Kind Support - Councillor Burke declared a Pecuniary Interest for the reason that his business has a contract in place with Cessnock Chamber of Commerce. Councillor Burke advised that he would leave the chamber and take no part in discussion and voting.

MM3/2019 – Minutes of the Organisational and General Managers Review Committee meeting held 11 March 2019 – The General Manager declared an Interest as the report is about himself and advised that he would leave the Chamber.

ADDRESS BY INVITED SPEAKERS

The following people addressed the meeting of Council:

Speakers	For / Against	Report	Page No.	Duration
Mr Rob Flanagan on behalf of Avery's Rise Residents	For Recommendation	Report Numbers PE12/2019 – PE35/2019 – proposing construction of a single storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision - Gullane Close & 9 Loch Lamond Avenue, Heddon Greta	41-617	
Mr Bob Lander - Tattersall Lander Pty Ltd	Against Recommendation	Report Numbers PE12/2019 – PE35/2019 – proposing construction of a single storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision - Gullane Close & 9 Loch Lamond Avenue, Heddon Greta	41-617	

PROCEDURAL MOTION

Moved:
Seconded:

Councillor Burke
Councillor Gray

798

RESOLVED

That having read and considered the reports in the agenda related to items:-

PE12/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/707/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	21 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	41
PE13/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/708/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	15 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	66
PE14/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/709/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	13 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	90
PE15/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/710/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	24 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	114
PE16/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/711/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	9 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	138
PE17/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/712/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	7 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	162
PE18/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/713/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	26 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	186
PE19/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/714/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	22 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	210
PE20/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/715/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	12 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	234

PE21/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/716/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	17 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	258
PE22/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/717/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	8 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	282
PE23/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/718/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	19 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	306
PE24/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/719/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	27 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	331
PE25/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/721/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	23 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	356
PE26/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/737/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	25 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	381
PE27/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/738/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	20 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	405
PE28/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/740/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	11 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	430
PE29/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/741/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	29 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	455
PE30/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/846/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	16 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	481
PE31/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/847/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	10 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	504

PE32/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/848/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	28 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	527
PE33/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/887/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	14 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	552
PE34/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/888/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	9 Loch Lomond Avenue, Heddon Greta	574
PE35/2019	Development Application No. 8/2018/941/1 proposing construction of a single-storey attached dual occupancy and strata title subdivision thereof	
	18 Gullane Close, Heddon Greta	595

Council adopt the recommendations as printed for those items.

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF ALL REPORTS BY ENGLOBE
OR INDIVIDUALLY WITH NOMINATED EXCEPTIONS**

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Doherty **Seconded:** Councillor Stapleford
799

RESOLVED

that having read and considered the reports in the agenda related to items

‡CC19/2019	Resolutions Tracking Report.....	621
‡CC20/2019	Investment Report - February 2019	622
W114/2019	Minutes of the Unsealed Roads Committee Held on 7 December 2018	633
W115/2019	Minutes of the Local Traffic Committee 18 February 2019	636
‡CO5/2019	Local Government NSW Save Our Recycling Campaign	662
‡CO6/2019	Cessnock Correctional Centre Access Road.....	663

Council adopt the recommendations as printed for those items.

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MAYORAL MINUTES

MAYORAL MINUTES NO. MM3/2019

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE ORGANISATIONAL AND GENERAL MANAGERS REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 11 MARCH 2019

The General Manager declared an Interest as the report is about himself and left the Chamber.

The General Manager left the meeting, the time being 6.57pm

MOTION Moved: Councillor Pynsent

800

RESOLVED

1. That the Minutes of the Organisational and General Managers Review Committee meeting of 11 March 2019 be adopted as a resolution of the Ordinary Council.
2. That Council receive and note the resignation of Stephen Glen, General Manager and that the Council agree to Mr Glen's last day of service being Wednesday, 31 July 2019.
3. That Council seek a minimum of three expressions of interest from suitably qualified management consultants to assist Council in the recruitment and appointment of a new General Manager including the facilitation of a workshop with Council to review the position description and develop a profile of the desired qualities for suitable candidates. The closing date for such expressions of interest will be 28 March 2019.
4. That the Organisational and General Managers Review Committee consider all expressions of interest received from the management consultants and make recommendations to Council for consideration at the Ordinary Council meeting of 3 April 2019.
5. That the Organisational and General Managers Review Committee reconvenes on 29 March 2019 at 9.00am to consider the expressions of interest for the recruitment of the General Manager.

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The General Manager returned to the meeting, the time being 7.07pm

MOTIONS OF URGENCY

MOTIONS OF URGENCY NO. MOU4/2019

SUBJECT: MOTIONS OF URGENCY

NIL

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE12/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/707/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

21 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

801

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/707/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 408 DP 1242225, 21 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms.
 - The development is non-compliant with the *'design elements'* provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE13/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/708/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

15 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

802

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/708/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 405 DP1242225 15 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms.

- The development is non-compliant with the ‘design elements’ provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.

(iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:

- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
- The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
- The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

(iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council’s decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *‘to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment’*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
5. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
7. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR

AGAINST

Councillor Olsen
 Councillor Doherty
 Councillor Dunn
 Councillor Fagg
 Councillor Stapleford
 Councillor Suvaal
 Councillor Fitzgibbon
 Councillor Gray
 Councillor Burke
 Councillor Sander
 Councillor Lyons
 Councillor Pynsent
Total (12)

Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE14/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/709/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

13 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

803

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/709/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 404 DP 1242225 13 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE15/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/710/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

24 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

804

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/710/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 417 DP 1242225 24 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the *'design elements'* provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE16/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/711/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

9 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

805

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/711/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 402 DP1242225 9 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE17/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/712/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

7 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

806

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/712/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 401 DP 1242225 7 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
- The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms.

- The development is non-compliant with the ‘design elements’ provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.

(iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:

- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
- The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
- The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

(iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council’s decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *‘to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment’*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
5. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
7. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR

AGAINST

Councillor Olsen
 Councillor Doherty
 Councillor Dunn
 Councillor Fagg
 Councillor Stapleford
 Councillor Suvaal
 Councillor Fitzgibbon
 Councillor Gray
 Councillor Burke
 Councillor Sander
 Councillor Lyons
 Councillor Pynsent
Total (12)

Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE18/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/713/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

26 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

807

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/713/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 416 DP 1242225 26 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE19/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/714/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

22 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

808

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/714/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 418 DP 1242225 22 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE20/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/715/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

12 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

809

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/715/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 423 DP 1242225 12 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE21/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/716/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

17 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

810

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/716/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 406 DP 1242225 17 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms.
 - The development is non-compliant with the *'design elements'* provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE22/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/717/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

8 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

811

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/717/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 425 DP 1242225 8 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE23/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/718/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

19 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

812

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/718/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 407 DP 1242225 19 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 1.4.1 of Chapter C.1 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that driveways must achieve a minimum setback from the side boundary of 1.5m.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.

- The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
 - For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 1.4.1 of Chapter C.1 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that driveways must achieve a minimum setback from the side boundary of 1.5m (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
5. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
7. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
8. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE24/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/719/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

27 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

813

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/719/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 411 DP 1242225 27 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms.

- The development is non-compliant with the ‘design elements’ provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.

(iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:

- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
- The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
- The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

(iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council’s decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *‘to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment’*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
5. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
7. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR

AGAINST

Councillor Olsen
 Councillor Doherty
 Councillor Dunn
 Councillor Fagg
 Councillor Stapleford
 Councillor Suvaal
 Councillor Fitzgibbon
 Councillor Gray
 Councillor Burke
 Councillor Sander
 Councillor Lyons
 Councillor Pynsent
Total (12)

Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE25/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/721/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

23 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

814

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/721/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 409 DP 1242225 23 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms.

- The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.

(iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:

- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
- The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
- The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

(iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
5. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
7. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR

AGAINST

Councillor Olsen
 Councillor Doherty
 Councillor Dunn
 Councillor Fagg
 Councillor Stapleford
 Councillor Suvaal
 Councillor Fitzgibbon
 Councillor Gray
 Councillor Burke
 Councillor Sander
 Councillor Lyons
 Councillor Pynsent
Total (12)

Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE26/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/737/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

25 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

815

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/737/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 410 DP 1242225 25 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms.

- The development is non-compliant with the ‘design elements’ provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.

(iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:

- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
- The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
- The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

(iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council’s decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *‘to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment’*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
5. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
7. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR

AGAINST

Councillor Olsen
 Councillor Doherty
 Councillor Dunn
 Councillor Fagg
 Councillor Stapleford
 Councillor Suvaal
 Councillor Fitzgibbon
 Councillor Gray
 Councillor Burke
 Councillor Sander
 Councillor Lyons
 Councillor Pynsent
Total (12)

Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE27/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/738/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

20 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

816

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/738/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 419 DP 1242225 20 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
- The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE28/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/740/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

11 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

817

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/740/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 403 DP 1242225 11 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE29/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/741/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

29 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

818

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/741/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 412 DP 1242225 29 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms.

- The development is non-compliant with the ‘design elements’ provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.

(iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:

- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
- The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
- The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

(iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council’s decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *‘to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment’*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
5. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
7. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR

AGAINST

Councillor Olsen
 Councillor Doherty
 Councillor Dunn
 Councillor Fagg
 Councillor Stapleford
 Councillor Suvaal
 Councillor Fitzgibbon
 Councillor Gray
 Councillor Burke
 Councillor Sander
 Councillor Lyons
 Councillor Pynsent
Total (12)

Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE30/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/846/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

16 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

819

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/846/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 421 DP 1242225 16 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
- The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE31/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/847/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

10 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

820

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/847/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 424 DP 1242225 10 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE32/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/848/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

28 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

821

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/848/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 415 DP 1242225 28 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE33/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/887/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

14 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

822

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/887/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 422 DP 1242225 14 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE34/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/888/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

9 LOCH LOMOND AVENUE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

823

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/888/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 432 DP 1246298 9 Loch Lomond Avenue Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.**
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:**

 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided for each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
 - For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:**

 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.**

2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.5 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum of 70m² of private open space is to be provided to each dwelling containing 3 or more bedrooms (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
5. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT NO. PE35/2019

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. 8/2018/941/1 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY AND STRATA TITLE SUBDIVISION THEREOF

18 GULLANE CLOSE, HEDDON GRETA

MOTION

824

RESOLVED

Moved: Councillor Burke

Seconded: Councillor Gray

1. That:

- (i) Development Application No. 8/2018/941/1 proposing construction of an attached single-storey dual occupancy and strata subdivision thereof, at Lot 420 DP 1242225 18 Gullane Close Heddon Greta, be refused pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, subject to the reasons for refusal contained in this report.
- (ii) The reasons for the decision (having regard to any statutory requirements applying to the decision), are as follows:
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment.
 - Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape.
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity.
 - The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided.
 - The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.

- For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest.
- (iii) In considering community views, the following is relevant:
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the low density residential intent of the locality, as prescribed within Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - The proposal would result in a loss of neighbourhood amenity as the proposed dual occupancy does not reflect a form of high quality urban design.
 - The proposal is non-compliant with the requirements of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010.
- (iv) The details contained above be publicly notified pursuant to Section 2.22 and Clause 20(2) of Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
2. That Council notify in writing the persons who made a submission with regard to the proposed development, of Council's decision.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone of the Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2011, which is *'to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment'*. Taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, cumulatively, the proliferation of this specific type of development will result in Gullane Close resembling a medium density, rather than low density, residential environment (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
2. Cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, the development will result in an adverse impact on the streetscape (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
3. The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and aims of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010. Specifically, the proposal is not a form of high quality urban design and cumulatively, taking into consideration a total of 23 development applications proposing the erection of single-storey dual occupancies within Gullane Close, does not encourage a high standard of residential amenity (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) and (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
4. The development is non-compliant with Clause 2.3.4 of Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010, which prescribes that a minimum front setback of 6m is to be provided (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

5. The development is non-compliant with the 'design elements' provisions relating to streetscape, external appearance and landscape design, as outlined in Chapter D.2 of the Cessnock Development Control Plan 2010 (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).
6. For the reasons outlined above, the development is contrary to the public interest (pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979).

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY

CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY NO. CC18/2019

**SUBJECT: 2019 NATIONAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT -
CALL FOR MOTIONS AND COUNCILLOR NOMINATIONS TO
ATTEND**

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Burke **Seconded:** Councillor Suvaal
825
RESOLVED

- 1. That Council endorse the request from Mayor Pynsent to attend the 2019 National General Assembly of Local Government.**
- 2. That Councillor Darrin Gray be endorsed to attend the 2019 National General Assembly of Local Government.**

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY NO. CC19/2019

SUBJECT: RESOLUTIONS TRACKING REPORT

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Doherty **Seconded:** Councillor Stapleford
826

RESOLVED

That Council receive the report and note the information.

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY NO. CC20/2019

SUBJECT: INVESTMENT REPORT - FEBRUARY 2019

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Doherty **Seconded:** Councillor Stapleford
827

RESOLVED

That Council receive the report and note the information.

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

WORKS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

WORKS AND INFRASTRUCTURE NO. WI13/2019

SUBJECT: CESSNOCK STOMP FESTIVAL - IN-KIND SUPPORT

Councillor Burke declared a Pecuniary Interest for the reason that his business has a contract in place with Cessnock Chamber of Commerce. Councillor Burke left the Chamber and took no part in discussion and voting.

Councillor Burke left the meeting, the time being 7.08pm

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Fitzgibbon **Seconded:** Councillor Gray
828

RESOLVED

1. That Council support the Stomp Festival by providing in-kind support as detailed in the report for waste management services and the provision and installation of road closure equipment in accordance with the Festival Traffic Control Plan;
2. That Council allocates an amount of \$4,000 from the Tourism Related Projects Budget to cover the cost of street vending and market stalls, as it is recognised that the event attracts a large number of visitors to the LGA and this directly supports Objective 2.3 of Council's Delivery Program 2017-21, which is to increase tourism opportunities and visitation in the area.
3. That Council suspends the operation of the Alcohol Free Zone in Vincent and Cooper Streets, Cessnock between the hours of 6.00am and 6.00pm on Sunday, 28 April 2019.
4. That the grants for the Stomp and Nostalgia Festivals be a one off for the current year and Council reviews funding for future events and festivals in our City

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Councillor Burke returned to the meeting, the time being 7.13pm

WORKS AND INFRASTRUCTURE NO. WI14/2019

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE UNSEALED ROADS COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 DECEMBER 2018

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Doherty **Seconded:** Councillor Stapleford
829
RESOLVED

That the recommendations of the Unsealed Roads Committee held 7 December 2018 be adopted as a resolution of the Ordinary Council being:

1. **URCOR3/2018 - That Council note the Committee's endorsement of the updated Terms of Reference for the Unsealed Roads Committee.**
2. **URCOR2/2018 - That Council note the status of Council's existing policies relating to unsealed roads and;**
 - **That the General Manager prepare a report on prioritising the sealing of urban unsealed roads, setting out criteria including length of road, cost, benefit, usage, and traffic volume.**
 - **That the General Manager examine ways of funding the prioritised sealing of urban unsealed roads.**
 - **That the General Manager investigate why some roads in Millview Estate are only partly sealed.**
 - **That the General Manager prepare suitable engagement material regarding the resealing of sealed roads.**
 - **That the General Manager investigate road conditions at the school bus stop on Wollombi Road adjacent to Brown Street, Bellbird.**

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

WORKS AND INFRASTRUCTURE NO. WI15/2019

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE LOCAL TRAFFIC COMMITTEE
18 FEBRUARY 2019**

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Doherty **Seconded:** Councillor Stapleford
830
RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Local Traffic Committee of 18 February 2019 be adopted as a resolution of the Ordinary Council being:

1. **TC1/2019** - That Council authorise the temporary regulation of traffic for the Kurri Kurri Nostalgia Festival event in accordance with Various Roads Kurri Kurri _ Nostalgia Festival TCPs.
2. **TC2/2019** - That Council install regulatory parking signage on the Mount View High School service road off Mount View Road, Cessnock, in accordance with the Mount View Road Cessnock _ Signage Diagram.
3. **TC3/2019** - That Council authorise installation of road signage and pavement marking on Avery's Lane, Heddon Greta in accordance with the Avery's Lane Heddon Greta _ Signage & Line Marking Diagram.
4. **TC4/2019** - That Council install regulatory parking signage and line marking on Lang Street, Kurri Kurri in accordance with Lang Street Kurri Kurri _ Signage & Line Marking Diagram Option 1.
5. **TC5/2019** - That Council note removal of existing load limits applied to:
 1. Neath Road, Neath, following replacement of the damaged culvert.
 2. Sandy Creek Road, Quorrobolong, following review of the culvert condition.
 3. High Street, Greta, due to changes in traffic flow.
6. **TC6/2019** - That Council install regulatory parking signage on Vincent Street, Cessnock, in accordance with the Vincent Street Cessnock _ Signage Diagram.
7. **TC7/2019** - That Council install regulatory parking signage and line marking on Lang Street, Kurri Kurri in accordance with Barton Street Kurri Kurri _ Signage & Line Marking Diagram.

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

WORKS AND INFRASTRUCTURE NO. WI16/2019

SUBJECT: NOTES OF THE INQUORATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD 1 MARCH 2019

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Burke **Seconded:** Councillor Lyons

831

RESOLVED:

1. That Council receives the notes of the inquorate Floodplain Management Committee meeting held 1 March 2019.
2. FLOCLM1/2019 - That Council adopt the updated Terms of Reference for the Floodplain Management Committee in relation to the date change from Friday at 9.00am to Wednesday at 9.00am
3. FLOCLM2/2019 – That Council note the status of the implementation of the Wollombi Flood Warning System.
4. FLOCLM3/2019 – That Council note endorsement of the outcomes of the Greta Flood Study, February 2019 by WMA Water by the inquorate Flood Management Committee.
5. FLOCLM3/2019 – That Council adopt the Greta Flood Study, February 2019 by WMA Water.
6. FLOCLM3/2019 - That the General Manager update relevant flood mapping and associated property notifications for flood related development controls, planning certificates and flood certificates within the Greta Flood Study area.
7. FLOCLM3/2019 - That the General Manager update the flood analysis for the Western Catchment as part of a future Floodplain Risk Management Study when suitable grant funding is available.
8. FLOCLM4/2019 - That Council note the endorsement of the outcomes of the Wallis and Swamp-Fishery Creek Flood Study, February 2019 by WMA Water by the inquorate Flood Management Committee.
9. FLOCLM4/2019 - That Council adopt the Wallis and Swamp-Fishery Creek Flood Study, February 2019 by WMA Water.
10. FLOCLM4/2019 - That the General Manager update relevant flood mapping and associated property notifications for flood related development controls, planning certificates and flood certificates within the Wallis and Swamp-Fishery Creek Flood Study area.
11. FLOCLM5/2019 - That Council note the status of the design of the South Cessnock Bund Wall Scheme.
12. FLOCLM6/2019 - That Council note the status of the Cessnock, and Abermain & Weston Flood Warning Systems.

FOR

Councillor Doherty
Councillor Dunn
Councillor Fagg
Councillor Stapleford
Councillor Suvaal
Councillor Fitzgibbon
Councillor Gray
Councillor Burke
Councillor Sander
Councillor Lyons
Councillor Pynsent
Total (11)

AGAINST

Councillor Olsen

Total (1)

CARRIED

BUSINESS OF WHICH WRITTEN NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

BUSINESS WITH NOTICE NO. BN5/2019

SUBJECT: POLICY - RATES SUBSIDY TO COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Fagg **Seconded:** Councillor Dunn
832

RESOLVED

1. That the General Manager undertake a review of the Policy “Rates Subsidy to Community Organisations”.
2. That a report be prepared for consideration by Council at the meeting of 17 April 2019 with a view of providing:
 - a. draft assessment criteria for determining an organisation’s eligibility for a subsidy up to the value of 50%.
 - b. a mechanism for an annual review of existing recipients and receipt of new applicants being undertaken in the month of March to allow for approval consideration for the financial year following.
 - c. a communication protocol for current organisations included in the current Policy to be advised of any revision of the Policy which would be applied to all rates subsidies commencing 1 July 2020.

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING NO. AQ23/2019

SUBJECT: MAINTENANCE OF PRIVATE CAR PARKS

The answer was noted.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING NO. AQ24/2019

SUBJECT: ROTARY PARK KURRI KURRI

The answer was noted.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING NO. AQ25/2019

SUBJECT: STATE MEMBER \$8M FOR ROAD WORK BACKLOG

The answer was noted.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING NO. AQ26/2019

SUBJECT: COUNCIL MEMBERSHIPS

The answer was noted.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING NO. AQ27/2019

SUBJECT: KURRI KURRI NETBALL COURTS

The answer was noted.

QUESTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING

Councillor Anne Sander

OLD NEATH RAILWAY STATION

Councillor Sander asked if Council can contact South Maitland Railway regarding the deteriorated state of the old Neath Railway Station.

Councillor Rod Doherty

UNSEALED ROADS COMMITTEE – MILLVIEW ESTATE ROAD/BROWN STREET, BELLBIRD

Councillor Doherty asked why the Unsealed Roads Committee has targeted Millview Estate roads and Brown Street, Bellbird.

Councillor Ian Olsen

GARBAGE TRUCK MOVEMENTS

Councillor Olsen asked how many streets or roads do the garbage trucks currently have to reverse out of or use reverse gear at the moment.

Councillor Ian Olsen

ROUNDAABOUT GINGERS LANE/HART ROAD

Councillor Olsen asked when he can expect to receive the design for the roundabout at Gingers Lane/Hart Road, and he would expect to receive it tomorrow.

Councillor Darrin Gray

KURRI KURRI COMMUNITY CENTRE ROOF

Councillor Gray asked for an update on where the Kurri Kurri Community Centre Roof repair is up to.

Councillor John Fagg

CAMP ROAD/LOVEDALE ROAD

Councillor Fagg referred to a previous question regarding the intersection of Camp and Lovedale Roads and asked when the work will be carried out.

The Director Works and Infrastructure advised that the works are scheduled to commence on 29 March 2019.

CORRESPONDENCE

CORRESPONDENCE NO. CO5/2019

SUBJECT: LOCAL GOVERNMENT NSW SAVE OUR RECYCLING CAMPAIGN

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Doherty **Seconded:** Councillor Stapleford
833

RESOLVED

That the correspondence be noted.

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CORRESPONDENCE NO. CO6/2019

SUBJECT: CESSNOCK CORRECTIONAL CENTRE ACCESS ROAD

MOTION **Moved:** Councillor Doherty **Seconded:** Councillor Stapleford
834

RESOLVED

That the correspondence be noted.

FOR	AGAINST
Councillor Olsen	
Councillor Doherty	
Councillor Dunn	
Councillor Fagg	
Councillor Stapleford	
Councillor Suvaal	
Councillor Fitzgibbon	
Councillor Gray	
Councillor Burke	
Councillor Sander	
Councillor Lyons	
Councillor Pynsent	
Total (12)	Total (0)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COUNCILLORS REPORTS

Councillor Olsen

Code of Conduct Training

Councillor Olsen advised that the Code of Conduct training has been scheduled for 1.30pm and advised that he does not finish work until 2.00pm and he will be late.

The Meeting Was Declared Closed at 7.20pm

CONFIRMED AND SIGNED at the meeting held on 3 April 2019

.....**CHAIRPERSON**

.....**GENERAL MANAGER**