

Hundred Hills Planning Proposal and Housekeeping Review PP10/0005 Submissions Summary Table

ECM NO	SUB #	Type E - email L- letter P - Proforma	SUBMISSION SUMMARY COMMENT	PLANNING COMMENT	RECOMMENDATON
3851221	3	L	<p>Concern regarding high concentration of sewer smells coming from the Hundred Hills estate. When it rains the Hundred Hills sewer is partially diverted to the Mount Ernest sewer system as a result of a closure of another system that serviced Hundred Hills. Last time contacted council was told that there was a new system being proposed/ tendered to eliminate this issue and should be done sometime soon and that TSC were looking into some type of odour eliminating system from the Mount Ernest system. Very concerned at the release of new land resulting in a further sewer build up prior to the sewer system being of a suitable nature.</p>	<p>This matter was passed onto the Water and Sewer unit who provided the following advice: <i>Council has been working with the locals for some time to try and fix this odour. It is difficult circumstances with the receiving gravity sewer design and the long detention time before reaching the Mount Ernest discharge point.</i> <i>We have been redirecting sewer up the old location to provide us time to install an odour control system and there has only been one occurrence that we changed the main over in the last 6 months.</i> <i>The odour control system has recently been installed at Riveroak Sewerage Pump Station and it introduces a product to prevent H2S from forming.</i> <i>It is yet to be commissioned but is likely to come on line in a few weeks. Locals in the receiving area will be advised prior to changing the flow over.</i> <i>Council has already carried out extensive works to try and prevent this odour but it is very difficult with the steep design of the sewer. Council will continue to work on the odour issues until resolved.</i> <i>The growth of the catchment will only help the odour because more flow will reduce the current retention time and the sewage will not be as septic.</i> The odour issues are related to the design, operation and the steepness of the land and will need to be addressed adequately in the future sewer servicing of the subject site.</p>	<p>Design and operational issues to be addressed at the DA stage. No amendments required.</p>
3877232	2	L	<p>Adjoining property owners and seeking to ensure that the redevelopment of the land does not impact on their RU2 rural landscape zone. Currently the property is used to evaluate different foraging seed varieties and they need to apply fertiliser and agricultural chemicals to manage these trials. Trust the future development will not impinge on their right to farm as is permitted under their current zoning. Disappointed that the rural vista will now be suburban but accept that urban expansion is beneficial to the region. Hope that Stockland will act as a responsible neighbour but have not found that to be the case to date.</p>		<p>No amendments required.</p>

ECM NO	SUB #	Type E - email L- letter P - Proforma	SUBMISSION SUMMARY COMMENT	PLANNING COMMENT	RECOMMENDATON
			<p>First concern is in relation to the natural waterway and drainage between the dame on the with west corner of the lot under development and the waterway that crosses onto their property supplying a dam on the north east corner. The dam is currently used for watering of livestock and previously for irrigating horticultural crops.</p> <p>Would like to ensure that any earthworks and subsequent development not restrict the water flow and not allow soil erosion to impact the fenceline and dam as has previously occurred (photos supplied).</p> <p>They were previously told by Stocklands (Julia Forster- Massey) that their dam was the erosion containment for the site – which cannot be allowed.</p> <p>Hope that Stocklands address the soak on their side and soil deposited over part of the fenceline and tidy up the waterway between the two dams when excavators are on site.</p>	<p>The Proposal seeks to drain part of the site to the dam and natural watercourse location as outlined in their Conceptual Stormwater Assessment, as exhibited.</p> <p>Whilst in principle this is an acceptable solution as a legal point of discharge given the location of the natural watercourse, the impact on the adjacent dam for stock watering is a key consideration.</p> <p>At a planning proposal stage, Council needs to be confident that the impacts of future development have been considered and may be suitably managed. The detail to achieve that level of suitable management is generally assessed at the development application (DA) stage.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, given the dam is not located on Stockland’s land the proponent was requested in early December to provide further advice regarding how earthworks and future development will not restrict the water flow to the dam, or result in erosion, sediment or water quality issues for the adjoining rural land. At the time of writing no further advice has been received.</p> <p>The Bulk Earthworks report by Mortons, as exhibited, indicates fill to the southern section of the subject site outside of the drainage corridor and approximately 15 metres into the drainage corridor, creating a steeper batter towards the southern section of the site than currently occurs.</p> <p>Whilst there may be an engineering solution to address the issue, there still remains uncertainty around the ability of the site to accommodate the stormwater flows without unacceptable impacts on the submitter’s dam in terms of water quality, sediment load and the impacts of the drainage on the already failing boundary fencing. It also remains unclear how much of the drainage treatment area will be located on the proponent’s land and how much on the submitter’s land.</p> <p>It is recommended that further information on the stormwater and drainage impacts on the dam is required prior to proceeding with the plan being made.</p>	<p>It is recommended that further information on the stormwater and drainage impacts on the dam is required prior to proceeding with the plan being made and that a timeframe restriction be applied to the submission of this information.</p>

ECM NO	SUB #	Type E - email L- letter P - Proforma	SUBMISSION SUMMARY COMMENT	PLANNING COMMENT	RECOMMENDATON
			Another issue is the fenceline. Submitters have been disappointed with Stockland (Julia Forster-Massey) response regarding fencing between the two properties. Fencing is unserviceable with rusty wires and broken posts. Submitter was happy to share cost of a new fence however; Stockland's lawyers said that this wasn't their responsibility as they didn't need to keep livestock contained. When pressed on the issue under the Dividing Fences Act they stated that the new fencing would be the responsibility of the future landowners.	The proponent was referred this submission in early December and asked to provide advice on the provision of fencing. It seems reasonable, that as a good neighbour, that the fencing which requires replacement, be undertaken by the current single owner rather than deferring the replacement of fencing to multiple future owners. Stockland have advised that they will consider the matter of fencing, however have made no commitment as a gesture of good will. Whilst Council does not generally get involved in the matter of dividing fences, this does provide an indication of Stockland's commitment to being a good neighbour and does not provide a lot of confidence as to their commitments on the following drainage and watercourse issues. It is noted that under the Dividing Fences Act Section 9, where the fence requires urgent work, the owner may carry out that work and the adjoining neighbour is liable for half the cost. This option is available to the submitter. No further amendment to the planning proposal is required.	No amendments required.
			Submitters seek clarity on the proposed extension of Castlefield Drive as it appears on the plans that this extension cuts across part of their property. Submitter's property is earmarked for future development and they are open to favourable zoning change.	The Castlefield Drive extension as proposed does not cut across the submitter's property. The future development of the road is intended to be accommodated on the proponent's land, however, should this change the proponent would need to negotiate with adjoining landowners. No further amendment to the planning proposal is required. Comments on future development are noted.	No amendment required.
Agency submissions					
3851174	1	L	Rural Fire Service - Received notice and being assessed.		
3876338	1A	L	Rural Fire Service - The RFS has reviewed the plans and raised no concerns or issues related to bushfire.	Noted	No further action required.