

PRELIMINARY PRE-LODGEMENT ADVICE – FORMER BOWLING CLUB SITE AT RICHMOND STREET, CASINO HELD VIRTUALLY ON 23 NOVEMBER 2021 AT 2PM

ATTENDEES:

Andy Edwards (Manager Development and Certification)
Chad Borgeest (Environmental Health Officer)
Deidre Coe (Development Concierge)
Georgia Campbell (Development Support Officer)
Pooja Chugh (Development Assessment Planner)
Travis Eggins (Development Engineer)

Anthony Nolan - Architect
Karina Vikstrom – Newton Denny Chapelle
Matt Daly and Mark Lawler – Inclusive Housing Australia

SITE: Former Bowling Site, Richmond Street, Casino

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing structures, sub-division, construction of group homes and associated civil and infrastructure works

GENERAL OVERVIEW: The subject site is zoned R1 – General Residential. The conceptual proposal, as submitted for the purpose of the meeting, is defined as a *group home*, which is permissible with consent in R1 zone.

The subject site is a former Bowling Club and located adjacent to the Casino Memorial Swimming Pool. In accordance with Council records, the site does not have an actual street address. The site comprises multiple allotments with an approximate overall site area of 4,574.5m².

As advised in the meeting, the plans submitted for the purpose of pre-lodgement meeting are conceptual and are not accompanied by a detailed scope of works or a Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE). It is understood that detailed drawings and reports will be prepared for any Development Application (DA) submitted. It is recommended that a follow up pre-lodgement meeting should be undertaken prior to the lodgement of a DA.

The following comments are based on a preliminary review of the concept plan forwarded to Council. A detailed assessment of the proposal may require further information.

PLANNING

- **Relevant Legislation/Requirements**

A *group home* is permissible pursuant to *Richmond Valley Local Environmental Plan (RVLEP) 2012* and *Affordable Rental Housing State Environmental Planning Policy (ARH SEPP)*. Depending upon the statute under which the application is made, the proposal shall address the relevant requirements of the *RVLEP 2012* or the *ARH SEPP*. The proposal will require removal of trees/vegetation, which should be assessed under the *Biodiversity and Conservation Act (BC Act)*.

Parts A, G, H, and I of *Richmond Valley Development Control Plan (RVDCP) 2021*, are most relevant to the proposal. The concept plan indicates that the proposal is non-compliant with the minimum 6m front setback requirements. In addition, the proposal is likely to be non-compliant with a minimum of 50% landscape area required within the front setback area. The proposed design does not include any living area in front portion of the building to provide passive surveillance of the street. In this regard, consideration shall be given to minimise any non-compliances and ensure that the proposal achieves

the intent and objectives of relevant requirements including Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

- **Heritage**

The subject site directly adjoins Casino Memorial Baths entrance façade which is listed as a heritage item (I38) pursuant to *RVLEP 2012*. *Furthermore*, the site is in the vicinity of a number of local heritage items. The proposed design and the materiality shall be informed by comments from a suitably qualified Heritage Consultant. A brief Heritage Impact Statement shall be submitted for assessment.

- **Other Considerations**

Richmond River is located to the south or rear of the subject site. In R1 General Residential zone, a minimum foreshore building line setback of 15m is required from the edge of the riverbank. In addition, south-west corner of the site is within high-hazard flood area, thus limiting its redevelopment potential/usability. It is recommended that a landscape buffer should be provided to the rear to minimise any impact on the habitat and wildlife corridor.

The intent and objective of Clause 6.8 – Riparian land and watercourses of the *RVLEP 2012*, is to protect and maintain riparian habitats. In this regard, the vegetation to the rear of the site, along Richmond Riverbank provides seasonal roosting site for Flying Fox Colony.

The proposal should consider noise, odour and general amenity impacts arising from the seasonal occurrence of Flying Fox Colony. Part I-11 of the *RVDCP 2021* recommends a minimum buffer distance of 50m from the wildlife corridor for residential areas. The interface between the proposal and the ecological occurrence must be given a careful consideration. In this regard, a formal 'Land Use Conflict Risk Assessment' (LUCRA) should be undertaken in addition to other considerations such as location of open space areas, keeping the vegetation pruned, etc. The proposal should be capable of maintaining adequate level of amenity for the future occupants.

It is considered that the rear portion of the site may not achieve its full redevelopment potential due to the above site constraints.

- **Amenity Impacts**

The site is adjacent to Casino Memorial swimming pool, which is undergoing upgrade works to include new swimming pools, waterslide, and associated amenities. The proposal shall consider the visual and acoustic amenity impacts arising from the adjacent use and include ameliorative measures such as landscape buffer, location of open space and living areas away from the noise generating use, privacy screening, and the like. The plans are to demonstrate how potential visual and acoustic amenity impacts are mitigated. The proposal shall also demonstrate how internal privacy and amenity is maintained between different *group homes* and other aspects of the development.

- **Parking**

Part I-4 (Car Parking) of *RVDCP 2021* provides the parking requirements. A *group home* generates one (1) parking space per ten (10) beds, plus one (1) per two supervisors or carers. Any reduction in the required number of parking spaces shall be supported by evidence such as car ownership, number of staff, parking provides by similar *group homes*.

- **Waste Management**

The proposal shall include details of how waste and recyclables will be managed during the demolition, construction, and ongoing phases of the development. Waste storage area capable of accommodating three (3) 240lt bins (one each for household waste, organic/green waste, and recyclables) for each *group home*, that is appropriately screened and preferably located within the rear yard shall be provided. Consideration shall also be given to how the waste will be collected (within the site/kerb side).

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:

- A Detailed Site Investigation (**Contamination Report**) would need to be prepared to assess and detail the status of the site and determine if any remediation is required on site.
- Flying fox colony, transient and last for a period of 6-12 weeks– noise (acoustic assessment) & odour to be addressed.
- A LUCRA Assessment will be required, Part I-11 (LUCRA) of the *RVDCP 2021* recommends a minimum buffer distance of 50m
- Combination of measures to ensure the safety of occupants from the flying foxes, such as buffer zone above, materials used on building, first flush etc

ENGINEERING:

Stormwater

The stormwater discharge for the proposed group homes to front Richmond Street will need to go to Richmond Street. There is existing kerb and gutter that the stormwater outlets can connect to. Future development at the rear of the site to go Richmond Street, however there may be potential for direct discharge to the river through current Council land. Direct discharge to the river would require consideration of many items prior to any approval, including by not limited to:

- Design of stormwater infrastructure and outlet. The outlet shall be designed to mitigate any form of erosion of the Richmond Riverbank. It is noted that the area between the lots in question and the river is heavily impacted by flood water in flood events, design should consider this i.e. backflow prevention etc.
- Internal to Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) – quality and quantity control, may require onsite detention (OSD) and onsite pre-treatment.
- Any vegetation removal approval (if any) – in accordance with the BDC Act
- Approval from RVC to construct the stormwater through Council land
- Assessment of connection detail with existing outlet to river at rear (if proposed). May require assessment of existing infrastructure i.e. capacity, velocity etc.
- Any and all other relevant planning instruments.
- Approval/Concurrence from other relevant agencies as necessary for direct discharge to the Richmond River.

Rainwater tanks and the like have the ability to be utilised for OSD, the tank must be designed to have sufficient capacity at the beginning of any intense rainfall event to be considered for OSD. There are a multitude of designs that can be undertaken to achieve this.

Flood

It was shown from survey data that ground levels recorded in the location of the potential group home development are in the realm of 24.4m – 24.6m AHD. Council's current 1% AEP flood event (derived from the Casino flood modelling undertaken in 1998) results in a varying flood level extent of 24.5m – 24.6m AHD over the Richmond Street property, resulting in a required minimum habitable floor level of 25.0m – 25.1m AHD.

It is noted that Council are in the process of revising and updating all formal flood modelling throughout our LGA with the project acquittal and formal adoption of the modelling (upon review of the final report and detailed modelling) is scheduled for early/mid 2022. From very early draft data there is a large uncertainty whether the updated modelling will result in an increase or decrease in the minimum habitable floor level at the Richmond Street property, as such I cannot confirm on whether or not it would be beneficial to lodge in the near future or after formalisation of the updated modelling.

Water/Sewer

Each proposed Torrens title allotment shall be adequately connected to water and sewer. As there is no detailed design, I do not have any further comment on the sewer and water design to service the development.

The proposed group homes and current water main on property are conflicting, rectification of the conflict will need to be undertaken (either removal of main on property or redesign of group home on East boundary) if the proposal is to go ahead.

Access

Access from Richmond street for all proposed group homes and residual land at the rear is fine.

Addressing

Currently the property has no street number. Street numbering of the property and any proposed development will likely be difficult due to 29B Richmond Street being one block to the west and 31 Richmond Street being one block to the east. There is no street numbering reserved for this property or any proposed development on said property.

Developer Contributions

Section 7.12 contributions will be applicable to any development on the property that exceed \$100,000. Given the proposal, it is presumed that the development will be in excess of \$200,000. If that is the case, then the Section 7.12 contribution applicable to the proposal will be equal to 1% of the total cost of development. See below, RVC's current rates for the Section 7.12 Levy.

Richmond Valley Section 94A Development Contributions Plan (2014)			
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 Levy area - full Richmond Valley Council		(Refer Finance for TechOne code)	
Total Cost of Development: \$		@ % of total cost	Contribution
<small>(as per DA application and CPI, but may be adjusted in accordance with Construction Certificate(s) where increased cost is greater than CPI)</small>			
\$ 0 - \$ 100,000	No levy	NIL – No levy	No levy
or if \$ 100,001 - \$ 200,000	\$	0.5 %	\$
or if > \$ 200,000	\$	1.0 %	\$

The existing bowling club at the rear of the property will utilise any credits for the property, hence any further development may result in Section 64 contributions. Section 64 contributions will be applicable to the any development on the property that will increase the demand on Council's water and sewer infrastructure. The ET rates utilised in the assessment for the applicability of Section 64 contributions for any proposal are outlined in the Section 64 Determinations of Equivalent Tenements Guidelines April 2017 developed by the Water Directorate (document known as the Water Directorate Guidelines for short). The group home proposal doesn't fit any particular definition within the Water Directorate Guidelines, however it was concluded that it would generate demand in excess of a typical house/home but would be less than that of a nursery/special care home as there is no medical facilities onsite. As such, the development best suits the boarding house definition.

As outlined in the Water Directorate Guidelines 2017, a boarding house development results in the demand of 0.33ETs of Water & 0.5ETs of Sewer demand per bedroom. From the plans of the group homes supplied to Council for the purposes of the pre-lodgement meeting the total demand for the development equals:

Site	Bedrooms	Water ET	Sewer ET
1	5	1.65	2.5
2	5	1.65	2.5
3	5	1.65	2.5
	Total	4.95	7.5

RVC's current rates for Section 64 contributions in the 2021/22 financial year are outlined below.

Section 64 Local Govt Act & Water Management Act 2000 Levy Area - Casino	TechOne Code	No. of ET's	Cost per ET (\$)	Amount Payable (\$)
RVC Water Headworks	WatS64Hwks	1.0	\$ 9,350.00	\$ 9,350.00
RVC Sewerage Headworks	SewS64Hwks	1.0	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 8,000.00
Rous Water # Water Headworks	Rous64Hwks	N/A	N/A	\$ NIL
Total Section 64 contributions (current @ _____ but generally applicable for payment 1/7/2021 to 30/6/2022) After 30/6/2022 payments will be in accordance with Council's Revenue Policy at the time of payment				\$ 17,350.00/ET

Hence, the Section 64 contributions are applicable to the pre-lodgement proposal for this financial year (2021/22) are:

Contribution	No. of ETs	Cost per ET	Total cost
Water	4.95	\$9,350.00	\$46,282.50
Sewer	7.5	\$8,000.00	\$60,000.00
	Total		\$106,282.50

CONCIERGE

During pre-lodgement stage, any enquiries or questions can be sent to Deidre Coe, Development Concierge.

Meeting concluded at 2.58pm.



Andy Edwards
Manager Development and Certification

Note: To assist you in providing accurate information to Council on your development proposal. The following Planning Circulars are recommended to guide you on establishing the Capital Investment Value/ cost of development of your development. Council reserves the right to require a suitably qualified person to provide evidence the CIV and Cost of Development is accurate.

CIV:

<http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Portals/0/planningsystem/PS%2010-008%20-%20CIV.pdf>

Cost of Development:

http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Portals/0/planningsystem/pdf/circulars/ps13-002_estimated_cost_of_development.pdf

Disclaimer: The minutes detailed above are based on discussions had between Council staff and representatives of the proponent of the development. Any advice given at the meeting and recorded in these minutes are based on best available information at the time of the meeting and are indicative only. Council reserves the right to require additional information or changes to the development once it has undertaken its assessment as part a formal development application.