Audio Disclaimer
An audio recording of this meeting is being made for minute taking purposes as authorised by City of Palmerston Policy MEE3 Recording of Meetings, available on Council’s Website.

1. PRESENT

Elected Members:  His Worship the Mayor Ian Abbott (Chair)
Deputy Mayor Heather Malone
Alderman Paul Bunker
Alderman Andrew Byrne
Alderman Sue McKinnon
Alderman Seranna Shutt

Staff:  Ricki Bruhn, Chief Executive Officer
Ben Dornier, Director of Corporate and Community Services
Mark Spangler, Director of Technical Services
Caroline Hocking, Minute Secretary

Gallery:  Gerard Rosse, Strategic Planner
Silke Reinhardt, Finance Manager
Dani MacDonald, Journalist NT News

2. APOLOGIES

Alderman Carter – Apology

ACCEPTANCE OF APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Moved:  Deputy Mayor Malone
Seconded:  Alderman Shutt

THAT the apology received from Alderman Carter be received and granted.

CARRIED 8/1390–03/02/2015

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved:  Deputy Mayor Malone
Seconded:  Alderman Shutt

1.  THAT the minutes of the Council Meeting held Tuesday, 13 January 2015 pages 7849 to 7857, be confirmed.

2.  THAT the Confidential minutes of the Council Meeting held Tuesday, 13 January 2015 pages 165 to 167, be confirmed.

CARRIED 8/1391–03/02/2015
4. **MAYOR’S REPORT**

Moved: Alderman McKinnon
Seconded: Alderman Shutt

1. THAT Council receives Report Number M8-07.

   CARRIED 8/1392–03/02/2015

   Moved: Alderman McKinnon
   Seconded: Alderman Shutt

2. THAT Council approves the Mayor attending the Regional Capitals Australia Regionalism 2.0 Conference being held in Mackay on 26 March 2015.

   CARRIED 8/1393–03/02/2015

The Mayor gave a verbal update on recent events.

5. **REPORT OF DELEGATES**

   Nil

6. **QUESTIONS (WITHOUT DEBATE) FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

   Nil

7. **QUESTIONS (WITHOUT DEBATE) FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS NOT BEEN GIVEN**

   Nil

8. **PETITIONS**

   Nil

9. **DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS**

   Nil

10. **CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

    Nil
11. **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

11.1 **Governance and Organisation**

The Chair invited Alderman Byrne, Chair of the Governance and Organisation Committee to provide a report to the meeting.

* A verbal report on the Special Committee Meeting held on 28 January 2015 was presented by Alderman Byrne.

Moved: Alderman Byrne  
Seconed: Alderman Bunker

THAT the minutes from the Special Governance and Organisation Committee meeting held on 28 January 2015 be received and noted and that Council adopts the recommendations made by the Committee and accordingly resolves as follows:

11.1.1 **New Financial Policies FIN22, FIN23, FIN24**  

GOC/0157

1. THAT Council approves FIN22 Grant Income Policy, with reporting to take place quarterly and the policy to be adjusted accordingly.

2. THAT Council approves FIN23 Credit Card Policy, with the formal dispute process with the bank being the responsibility of finance and the policy to be adjusted accordingly.

3. THAT Council approves FIN24 Chart of Accounts Policy.

11.1.2 **Expression of Interest Insurance Services**  

GOC/0160

1. THAT the Governance and Organisation Committee be the assessing body for any Expression of Interests or tender process for insurance, and that officers seek quotes from any appropriate insurance advisor.

2. THAT the Chair of the Governance and Organisation Committee be authorised to liaise with staff regarding Council’s future insurance requirements.

3. THAT Council approves the release of the Expression of Interest Insurance Services document.

**CARRIED 8/1394–03/02/2015**
11.2 Economic Development and Infrastructure

Nil

11.3 Community Culture and Environment

Nil

12. INFORMATION AGENDA

12.1 Items for Exclusion

Nil

12.2 Receipt of Information Reports

Moved: Alderman McKinnon
Seconded: Deputy Mayor Malone

THAT the information items contained within the Information Agenda, be received.

CARRIED 8/1395–03/02/2015

The Chair invited the Chief Executive Officer, Director of Corporate and Community Services and Director of Technical Services to provide a verbal update on the outstanding matters contained within the Action Report.

Officers provided a verbal report to the meeting and answered questions from Elected Members.

13. DEBATE AGENDA

13.1 Officer Reports

13.1.1 Appointment of Chair to the Committees of Council 8/0618

Moved: Alderman Byrne
Seconded: Alderman Shutt

1. THAT Council receives Report Number 8/0618.

CARRIED 8/1396–03/02/2015
13.1.1 Appointment of Chair to the Committees of Council (continued) 8/0618

The Mayor called for nominations for the position of Chair to the Committees. The following nominations were received:

- Community, Culture and Environment; Alderman Shutt, Deputy Mayor Malone
- Governance and Organisation; Alderman Byrne
- Economic Development and Infrastructure; Alderman Bunker

MEETING PROCEDURES

Suspension of Standing Orders

Moved: Alderman McKinnon
Seconded: Alderman Bunker

THAT Standing Orders be suspended to allow for open discussion on the appointment of Chair to the Committees of Council.

CARRIED 8/1397–03/02/2015

Standing Orders were suspended at 7:10pm

Reinstatement of Standing Orders

Moved: Alderman McKinnon
Seconded: Deputy Mayor Malone

THAT Standing Orders be reinstated.

CARRIED 8/1398–03/02/2015

Standing Orders were reinstated at 7:27pm

Alderman Shutt withdrew her nomination for Chair of the Community, Culture and Environment Committee.
13.1.1 Appointment of Chair to the Committees of Council
(continued) 8/0618

Moved: Alderman McKinnon
Seconded: Alderman Byrne

2. THAT Deputy Mayor Malone be appointed as Chair to the Community, Culture & Environment Committee for a period of 12 months taking effect from 18 February 2015.

3. THAT Alderman Bunker be appointed as Chair to the Economic Development & Infrastructure Committee for a period of 12 months taking effect from 18 February 2015.

4. THAT Alderman Byrne be appointed as Chair to the Governance & Organisation Committee for a period of 12 months taking effect from 18 February 2015.

CARRIED 8/1399–03/02/2015

13.1.2 City of Palmerston City Centre Car Parking Advisory Group 8/0620

Moved: Alderman Bunker
Seconded: Alderman McKinnon

1. THAT Council receives Report Number 8/0620.

2. THAT Council endorses the following members of the City of Palmerston City Centre Car Parking Advisory Group.

- Mr Paolo Randazzo
- Mr Brendan Dunn
- Mr Ross Finocchiaro
- Mr Adam Marcon
- Ms Kylie Wilson
- Ms Margaret Rose Schoenfisch
- Mr Matthew Stone
- Ms Bonnie Copley

CARRIED 8/1400–03/02/2015

14. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil

15. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

At the invitation of the Chair

Nil
16. OTHER BUSINESS - ALDERMAN REPORTS

16.1 Deputy Mayor Malone

Provided an update on the Seniors Advisory meeting held on 2 February 2015 and congratulated Marg Lee on achieving citizen of the year.

Advised Helen Wilson from the Oasis Shopping Centre has informed that a defibrillator will be installed in the Shopping Centre ready for the opening launch in March.

16.2 Alderman Byrne

Provided an update on Social Media community feedback in relation to budget expenditure.

16.3 Alderman Bunker

Had an interview with ABC Radio in relation to Social Media community feedback and noted the Palmerston Sun article in relation to small Lot developments in Zuccoli.

17. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

17.1 Subdivision to create 181 lots over Lot 4251 (575) Roystonea Avenue, Zuccoli

Moved: Deputy Mayor Malone
Seconded: Alderman McKinnon

1. THAT pursuant to Section 65 of the Local Government Act, Council orders that the public be excluded from the meeting with the exception of the Chief Executive Officer, Minute Secretary, Director of Corporate Community Services, Director of Technical Services and Strategic Planner on the basis that Council considers it necessary and appropriate to act in a manner closed to the public in order to receive, discuss and consider the Committee Recommendations in relation to confidential agenda item 17.1 Subdivision to create 181 lots over Lot 4251 (575) Roystonea Avenue, Zuccoli and that Council is satisfied that the meeting should be conducted in a place open to the public is outweighed in relation to the matter because receiving, considering and discussing the report and associated documentation involves:

   (c) information that would, if publicly disclosed, be likely to:

      (iv) prejudice the interests of the council or some other person

This item is considered confidential pursuant to Regulation 8 (c)(iv) of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations.
2. THAT Council orders that the minutes from the Confidential Council meeting held on 3 February 2015, in relation to confidential item number 17.1 Subdivision to create 181 lots over Lot 4251 (575) Roystonea Avenue, Zuccoli and associated documents remain confidential and not available for public inspection for a period of 12 months from the date of this meeting or a lesser period as determined by the Chief Executive Officer.

CARRIED 8/1401–03/02/2015

The meeting moved into the Confidential Session at 7:41pm

17.2 Moving Decisions from the Confidential Session into the Open Session

In accordance with the resolution of Council, the following decisions from the Confidential Session are moved into the Open Session:

Subdivision to create 181 lots over Lot 4251 (575) Roystonea Avenue, Zuccoli 8/0621

- THAT Council receives Report Number 8/0621.
- THAT Council accepts the tabled document from HWL Ebsworth Lawyers dated 3 February 2015 titled “Town Planning and the application of FD Zoning” as Attachment D.
- THAT Attachment A to Report Number 8/0621 be endorsed.
- THAT the Mayor, Chief Executive Officer, Director of Technical Services and Chair of the Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee meet with the Chief Executive of Department of Lands and Planning to discuss the legal advice outlined in Attachment D.
- THAT the outcome of the discussion with the Chief Executive of Department of Lands and Planning be brought back to Council in the form of a report.
- THAT the resolutions and Attachment A be released to the Public Record.

18. CLOSURE

Meeting closed at 8.55pm

(Chair)
28 January 2015

Ms Deborah Curry
Development Assessment Services
Department of Lands, Planning and Environment
GPO Box 1680
DARWIN NT 0801

Dear Deborah

PA2014/1034
Development Application - Lot 4251 (575) Roystonea Ave, Zuccoli NT
Subdivision of Zuccoli Stages 3 and 4 (Sub-Stage One)

Thank you for the Development Application referred to this office on 9 January 2015, concerning Lot 4251 (575) Roystonea Ave. This letter was endorsed by Council at its ordinary meeting held on Tuesday 3 February, 2015 and provides further explanation of Council’s objection to the Statutory/Procedural process intended to be undertaken to assess this application prior to the Minister’s intended ultimate zoning being known and additional technical information to Council’s letter of 23 January 2015 in response to the application.

Statutory / Procedural

Council objects to the application on the basis that the Area Plans do not specify intended ultimate zoning and only specifies the intended ultimate uses in a general sense, it would have been impossible to raise relevant objections when the Area Plans were originally proposed. For example, if City of Palmerston was content with an area being earmarked generally for residential uses, but considered the area unsuitable for medium density housing (ie MD zoning), it would not have been appropriate for City of Palmerston to object to the Area Plan which merely slated the area as residential in general use.

At this time, the Minister has not given direction of the specific zones proposed within this FD site, either by letter of statement or by advertising any amendment for a rezoning of this area. As the intended ultimate zoning of the land is as yet unstated by the Minister and the Minister is the sole approving body for Planning Scheme Amendments, we cannot support or fully assess this application. Council highlights that the blanket MD zoning proposed could have considerable bearing on future infrastructure requirements within the suburb. The proposed zoning has the potential to also result in future piecemeal type development with poor amenity outcomes for residents which Council views as an undesirable outcome for the site.

In making the further comments in this submission Council has assumed that the Minister has clearly articulated the intended ultimate zoning for the FD site and that the intended ultimate zoning is that shown in PA2014/1034. Council wishes to lodge the following submission under ATTACHMENT A
Section 49 of the Planning Act, in which the Council objects to the granting of a Development Permit for the following reasons:

Road Design and Hierarchy

a) Council has significant concerns with the proposed road hierarchy. Despite the applicant’s claim on page 15, many of the proposed roadways do not meet the City of Palmerston’s design guidelines. SMEC Drawing No.30080027E-MP-200 illustrates the proposed road hierarchy plan. Council notes the inconsistency of the following proposed roads with Council’s guidelines:

i. The plan notes primary collector roads with carriageway widths of between 8.0-11.0m. Council requires a minimum carriageway width of 11.0m on primary collector roads.

ii. The plan notes secondary collector roads with carriageway widths of between 7.2-8.0m. Council requires a minimum carriageway width of 8.0m on secondary collector roads.

iii. Council also requires a minimum 8.0m carriageway width on all roads fronting lots in Zone MR.

iv. The plan notes minor roads with carriageway widths of 6.0m, which is not permitted. Council requires a minimum carriageway width of 7.0m on minor roads. Additionally, required carriageway widths are also impacted by the number of dwellings constructed on the subject street. Council will conduct a more thorough assessment of the proposed carriageway widths and will provide this additional information to the applicant and the consent authority.

b) Elements of the proposed road layout are in conflict with Council’s draft subdivision guideline which does not support cul-de-sacs and Council does not accept cul-de-sacs within this development. The cul-de-sacs within Stage 1 and within the other stages of this development should be reworked and removed. Council notes that opportunities for through connections occur with a large number of the proposed cul-de-sac and these are Councils preferred outcome in the majority of cul-de-sac locations. It is recommended that the applicant meet with Council staff to discuss options for interconnecting the streets within the development without the need for cul-de-sacs.

c) Council objects to the designation for part of the West Loop Road as a Collector Road and is of the view that this road should be designated a Sub-Arterial road for its entire length. Road hierarchy is a function of a roads position in the network not traffic volume. While traffic volume may reduce along the Western Loop Road its function is unchanged.

d) The application indicates that some roads may have sidewalks on only one side. Council provides the following Council guidelines for reference:

i. Minor and Local Access Roads can have footpaths on only one side.

ii. Collector Roads should have footpaths on both sides.

iii. Sub-arterial Roads should have a 2.5m wide shared path for pedestrians and cyclists on one side and a standard footpath on the other side.
e) Proposed Lot 030 and Road 8 are in conflict with Council's draft subdivision guidelines, as the total number of units possible within this development will be in excess of the maximum that should be accessed via a cul-de-sac. Council notes that the applicant should consider whether Road 8 should connect through to Zuccoli Parade to improve vehicular connectivity in the locality.

f) The layout of Lot 001 is considered a poor design, with a large medium density development accessed by a cul-de-sac that is further complicated by being located directly adjacent the school site. As noted elsewhere within this letter of response, Council does not accept the proposed 6m pavement width of the minor road proposed adjacent this lot. It is recommended that the applicant consider removal of the cul-de-sac to the north of the site and allowing Road 3 to curve from Road 2 to the South Loop Road, without the need for the cul-de-sac. The land area gained from removal of the cul-de-sac could be incorporated into Lot 001 and adequate site access could still be achieved.

g) In general, Council does not support higher density development at the end of cul-de-sacs. This design results in the largest number of vehicles passing in front of all lots within a cul-de-sac, rather than the opposite occurrence when higher density development is located at the entrance to a street. Further, when higher density development is located in a cul-de-sac, there are often issues with the ability to adequately service the sites and only limited, if any, on-street parking occurs for visitors. In particular, the design of Lot 004 and Lot 014 is not ideal. Without restrictions other than lot size and zoning on the number of units to be developed here, as proposed, it is possible for 5 units to be developed in this cul-de-sac. It appears that a minimum of 10 bins would be required to service these dwellings. Coupled with the need for driveway access, it is not clear whether servicing, with or without on-street parking, could be accomplished in this cul-de-sac on Road 4.

h) It is unclear how the proposed up to four storey multiple dwellings allowed by the parcels designated in Zone MR that front Zuccoli Parade will integrate with the future Stage 5 of Zuccoli. If these parcels are to be officially zoned MR, Council would be interested in an assessment of whether these parcels would be better serviced off of Zuccoli Parade, rather than narrow internal streets and cul-de-sacs for the large volume of traffic that could be expected from sites that could produce over 30 dwellings on each site.

i) Road 4 is proposed to terminate in a cul-de-sac with a pedestrian walkway connection to the South Loop Road. It appears that this walkway is the same width as the verge, or 4.5m. Council notes that walkways are usually required to be 12-15m in width to satisfy CPTED concerns.
Traffic Assessment

j) Council questions the significant differences in traffic figures and traffic volume estimates for the same site between the GHD report from April 2014 commissioned by the NT Government and the SMEC report from December 2014 provided by the applicant.

Council notes that the estimated density of the site has increased from 1,357 dwellings in the GHD report to 1,775 dwellings assessed in the SMEC report, yet the overall amount of traffic estimated from the development has decreased within the SMEC report.

Council seeks an independent review of the traffic modelling for the development.

k) According to the GHD report, traffic volumes on the West Loop Road do not permit driveway access to this road. Therefore, Council will not take over this roadway.

l) Council queries more information on the plans for Zuccoli Parade south of the roundabout at Lots 001 and 028.

Density and Zoning

m) Council notes that there are many lots designated on the proposed subdivision and land use plan that designate a property as being within Zone MD but listed as a single dwelling. It is noted that when a property is within Zone MD, the allowable density for that lot is 1 dwelling per 300m². Therefore, for each lot of 600m² or greater, more than one dwelling would be permitted by right under the proposed zoning designation. It is queried as to how those lots designated as single dwelling but larger than 600m² will be restricted to one dwelling within the development. If a single dwelling is intended on these lots, it is recommended that some form of formal restriction be placed on those lots, such that the consent authority must not consent to more than a single dwelling on these lots. For lots of 800m² or greater, it is recommended that these lots be formally designated as being within Zone SD.

Unrestricted MD lots at the time of subdivision have the potential to add considerable cost to the land released. Service authorities are likely to design reticulated services to meet the demands of the ultimate maximum density. This would result in excess capacity in the services provided and an unnecessary cost to land purchasers.

n) Council has significant concerns over the interface between properties in Zone MR and properties in Zone MD that will have single dwellings. With respect to ensuring an appropriate level of amenity occurs between the zones, there are certain to be privacy and overlooking issues from four storey developments on Lots 001, 002, 003, 028 and 029 and the adjacent single dwellings. In particular, Lots 021-027 will suffer from overlooking.
o) Council recommends that the applicant and consent authority consider whether Lots 028 and 029 would be more appropriate as lots in Zone MD rather than Zone MR.

p) Council is concerned with the total amount of small lots overall. The subdivision is extremely dense, with over 80% of the lots proposed in Stage 1 being less than 500m² in area. Council would prefer a wider mix of lots. Overall, the traffic modelling for the subdivision within the application notes 1,775 lots. It is noted that this is over 1,000 more lots than the application noted was required by the original NT Government call for proposals for the site. It is considered that a greater degree of variation in lot sizes and zones would not be unreasonable in this proposed development.

q) Council notes that the proposed area of land in Zone CP has reduced dramatically in size from that depicted in the Area Plan and submits that the current proposal does not comply with the Area Plan. According to the Area Plan, Council would have expected the land in Zone CP to front two major roadways within the development rather than only Zuccoli Parade. The concentration of the school community purpose uses on the eastern side of the development will have an impact on the GHD traffic impact assessment.

r) Council has significant concerns regarding the Concept Master Plan’s indication that there intends to be further investigations of the possibility of urban development within the public open space areas adjacent Mitchell Creek. Council notes that the amount of public open space provided for the development will dramatically decrease if additional urban development is proposed in these areas in the future. Additionally, the impact of that development on Mitchell Creek is unknown and has not been addressed by the application or within the community. Further development will also impact on the traffic volumes using the local network.

s) Council believes that there should be a more gradual transition between zones in Stage 4 adjacent the proposed rural residential properties. In particular, the proposal for sites in Zone MR at four storeys across the street from over 4,000m² rural residential properties in Zone RR seems incongruous. An improved transition is necessary between properties in Zone RR and any higher density uses. Council encourages the applicant to consider the gradual transition of zones as the most appropriate means to achieving a gradual transition.

Public Open Space

t) There are 181 lots proposed within Stage 1, with almost nil public open space proposed in this stage. Three small parcels are designated as public open space, each appearing approximately 250m² in size. While it is acknowledged that the intent is for the entire subdivision as a whole to exceed the 10% of public open space required for the subdivision, it is not considered appropriate to provide 181 lots with so little public open space. Council is not comfortable offering support for this current design, as there may be a possibility that if for some reason the remainder of the development did not go ahead, these residents, including the large lots of medium density development, would be without public open space.
In particular, it is noted that the Concept Master Plan shows several larger areas of public open space in Stages 2 and 3 that is immediately adjacent Stage 1. It is recommended that portions of these public open space areas be incorporated into Stage 1.

**Designated Open Space**

u) Clarification of the intent of the “designated open space” areas on the building envelope plans is requested. It appears that this space is contained within the boundaries of each lot but its purpose is not clear. As the covenants proposed restrict front fences, it is queried how the applicant sees this as usable, rather than dead, space for each lot.

**Development Permit for Subdivision versus Development Permit for Development**

v) Council notes that the application is for subdivision, yet several proposals are made within the application and variations requested to clauses that are applicable at further Development Application stage for individual lots, rather than at the time of subdivision.

The request for setback reductions and changes to parking layouts at this stage seems premature and/or should not be the subject of a subdivision but rather a rezoning application for a specific use zone or at the time of development.

Council has in particular identified that setbacks and tandem parking may be applicable to this concern.

However, we note that there may be other waivers requested as part of this application that are more typical to a development permit for development on the site, rather than a development permit for subdivision. Should the Development Assessment Services or Development Consent Authority identify any other matters of this nature, it is requested that these issues be highlighted to Council for specific comment prior to consideration of these issues at a consent authority meeting.

The concern of Council is that if council were to make no comment on these issues as they are presented for examination at the inappropriate time, yet the consent authority consider the issues regardless, then Council may have lost the opportunity to comment on these issues.

It is unclear how any variation granted at subdivision stage would be carried forward and applied to development of any individual lot, as the subdivision permit typically expires or ceases to apply once new titles are issued for the lots. Council requires that any waivers granted be somehow required to carry forward after the subdivision permit typically ceases to apply to the site.

The next bullet points will accordingly address the two concerns identified by Council at this time, for the consent authority’s consideration.
Building Setbacks

w) The application asked for reduced setbacks on 129 of the proposed 179 lots, or 72% of the lots. This is not considered a minor variation but rather an overarching design ideal that should be potentially considered for a rezoning of the site, rather than a large scale variation.

x) Council strongly objects to the reduction to a 3.0m building wall setback and a 1.5m setback for features without external walls. For these sites, with the permitted 0.9m eave overhang, it would be possible to have only 600mm between a building and the front property boundary.

y) Further, it is noted that the building envelope plans for Lots 015-027 appear to show the setback from the additional “designated open space area” depicted on the plans, rather than from the property boundary. Clarification on the intent of this depiction is requested.

z) It is noted that additional lots have requested changes to the primary and secondary street frontages. While it is noted that Council has not at this time reviewed the merits of these proposals for each individual lot, in general Council does not have an objection to this variation.

aa) Council notes that the plans and covenants appear to show the car parking spaces on the site at the building wall at a minimum. Council approves of this design but requests that a minimum of 6m of driveway be provided on the lot between the end of the carport or garage and the property boundary, to allow a vehicle to park within the property boundaries without overhanging the verge or footpath.

Tandem Parking

bb) Council recognizes the notation on the proposed building envelope plans for two separately accessed car parking spaces on lots with a street frontage of 13m or less. Clause 6.54(2) of the NT Planning Scheme requires lots with a street frontage of 13m or less to have tandem parking. In this instance, Council notes that while tandem parking for these lots is the standard within the NT Planning Scheme, Council would support a waiver to this clause to allow separately accessed car parking spaces on each lot.

Stormwater Drainage

cc) A site stormwater drainage plan indicating how the concentrated flow is to be collected on site and connected to Council’s stormwater drainage system shall be provided to the satisfaction of the City of Palmerston, prior to the commencement of works. No stormwater will be permitted to discharge across the boundary to the neighbouring property.

dd) Council commends the developer in adopting ornamental lakes as the primary form of stormwater drainage cleansing. Council considers that design more acceptable to the community than bio-retention basins and wetlands.

Council comments on issues for which it is the sole responsible authority, under the Local Government Act and associated by-Laws:
Should this application be approved, the following conditions pursuant to the Planning Act and Council's responsibilities under the Local Government Act are also recommended for inclusion in the Development Permit issued by the Development Consent Authority.

a) Engineering design and specifications for the proposed and affected roads, including:
   i. street lighting,
   ii. stormwater drainage,
   iii. vehicular access,
   iv. pedestrian/cycle corridors,
   v. street-scaping and landscaping of nature strips;
shall be submitted for approval by the Director Technical Services; with all approved works constructed at the applicant's expense to the requirements of the City of Palmerston.

b) Any easements or reserves required for the purposes of stormwater drainage, roads, access or for any other purpose, shall be made available free of cost to the City of Palmerston and/or neighbouring property owners.

If you require any further discussion in relation to this application please feel free to contact me on 8935 9958.

Yours sincerely

Mark Spangler
Director Technical Services