

O P GRAND

**MINUTES OF HOPE ISLAND STR  
 MASTER PLAN STEERING COM**

EXHIBIT No. 242  
 .....CLERK

<b>DATE</b>	23 June 2003
<b>TIME START:</b>	2:30pm
<b>TIME FINISHED:</b>	4:00pm
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Room 1, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
<b>PRESENT:</b>	<p>Councillor Alan Rickard – Chairman (“AR”)                  Greg Young – Gold Coast City Council - Director EDMP (“GY”)                  Rob Alcock – Gold Coast City Council - EDMP (“RA”)                  Ceinwen Hooper – Gold Coast City Council – EDMP (“CH”)                  Steve Harrison – Gold Coast City Council – EDMP (“SH”)                  Chris Netherway – Gold Coast City Council – PET (“CN”)                  Chris Stevens – Gold Coast City Council – Engineering Services (“CS”)                  David Montgomery - Gold Coast City Council – City Solicitor (“DM”)                  Craig Gore – Aurora Developments Pty Ltd (“CG”)                  Michael Adamson – Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd (“MA”)                  John Fish – Fish Developments Pty Ltd (“JF”)                  Edwin Yu (“EY”)                  Gerard Cassar (“GC”)</p>

**AGENDA ITEMS:**

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> AR introduced each individual present.	
2.	<b>FORMATION AND PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE (CHARTER, STATUS, ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, MEETING SCHEDULE ETC)</b> GY informed Committee that Council was about to embark upon a process to develop a Structure Plan for the Hope Island region this week. For this reason, the Committee meeting was brought forward to today. PET is responsible for conducting the process. GY explained that the purpose of this Committee was to ensure that a Structure Master Plan was developed for the Hope Island region which complemented the standard of development being pursued by developers in the region. CG commented that the purpose of the Committee was to also ensure that a co-ordinated approach was undertaken by all relevant Council departments to facilitate the efficient development of the region.	

O P GRAND

**MINUTES OF HOPE ISLAND STR  
 MASTER PLAN STEERING COM**

EXHIBIT No. 292  
 [Signature] CLERK

<b>DATE</b>	23 June 2003
<b>TIME START:</b>	2:30pm
<b>TIME FINISHED:</b>	4:00pm
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Room 1, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
<b>PRESENT:</b>	<p>Councillor Alan Rickard – Chairman (“AR”)                  Greg Young – Gold Coast City Council - Director EDMP (“GY”)                  Rob Alcock – Gold Coast City Council - EDMP (“RA”)                  Ceinwen Hooper – Gold Coast City Council – EDMP (“CH”)                  Steve Harrison – Gold Coast City Council – EDMP (“SH”)                  Chris Netherway – Gold Coast City Council – PET (“CN”)                  Chris Stevens – Gold Coast City Council – Engineering Services (“CS”)                  David Montgomery - Gold Coast City Council – City Solicitor (“DM”)                  Craig Gore – Aurora Developments Pty Ltd (“CG”)                  Michael Adamson – Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd (“MA”)                  John Fish – Fish Developments Pty Ltd (“JF”)                  Edwin Yu (“EY”)                  Gerard Cassar (“GC”)</p>

**AGENDA ITEMS:**

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> AR introduced each individual present.	
2.	<b>FORMATION AND PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE (CHARTER, STATUS, ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, MEETING SCHEDULE ETC)</b> GY informed Committee that Council was about to embark upon a process to develop a Structure Plan for the Hope Island region this week. For this reason, the Committee meeting was brought forward to today. PET is responsible for conducting the process. GY explained that the purpose of this Committee was to ensure that a Structure Master Plan was developed for the Hope Island region which complemented the standard of development being pursued by developers in the region.  CG commented that the purpose of the Committee was to also ensure that a co-ordinated approach was undertaken by all relevant Council departments to facilitate the efficient development of the region.	

The Committee will also be responsible to confer with State agencies (such as the Main Roads Department) to achieve the objectives of the Committee. CG explained that he had spoken with the Minister for Main Roads who was endeavouring to deal with a number of issues which would facilitate Eddie Peters ability to attend the Committee meetings and contribute positively.

It was agreed that the Committee should not seek to obtain "advisory committee" status as this would require Council approval.

It was resolved that MA was to refine an informal Charter for the Committee for consideration by the Committee next week.

It was further resolved that Major Projects would be charged with the responsibility of administering the Committee (so far as other Council departments were concerned).

Further, it was resolved that:

- a) Major Projects are to be involved in all facets of the Committee's activities to the extent that Council is involved in the process;
- b) RA is to be the single point of accountability on behalf of Major Projects.

AR announced that he is willing to continue to Chair the weekly Committee meetings (and in his absence, GY is to Chair the meetings).

GY agreed to remain a member of the Committee (and Chair the meetings in the event of AR's unforeseen absence).

After a brief discussion about whether it was necessary to involve Gold Coast Water in the Committee, it was resolved that the Committee would proceed on an "as is needed" basis to mitigate over supply of Council resources.

It was further resolved that where an agenda item anticipated the involvement of a Council department or officer not involved with the Committee, Major Projects are responsible to ensure relevant officer to be in attendance at relevant Committee meeting.

CG expressed surprise with Noel Pearson's absence. It was noted CW represented PET, despite being from the sub-divisions section.

AR will advise Council Co-ordination Meeting on Friday 27 June 2003 of the formation of the Committee and seek appropriate sanction for the Committee.

CG undertook to keep following parties (as reference parties) updated in relation to the progress achieved by the Committee:

- Sanctuary Cove
- Hope Island Resort
- Riverlinks
- State Government (and in particular Peta-Kaye Croft).

MA to refine basic Charter of Committee

AR to advise Co-ord of formation of C/ee and seek sanction

	<p>JF undertook to keep following parties (as reference parties) updated in relation to the progress achieved by the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hope Island Canal Association</li> <li>• Neumann's - dredging contractor</li> </ul> <p>Resolved that Committee would meet every Monday at 2:30pm (until Committee decides alternate intervals for meetings).</p> <p>It was further resolved that all Agenda items to be submitted to RA and/or SH by Friday immediately preceding weekly meeting for inclusion on Agenda for following Monday's meeting. Agenda to be distributed by SH via email on Monday morning preceding weekly meeting.</p>	<p>RA and SH to manage administration of meetings</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>PROJECT CO-ORDINATION</b> (COVERED IN PREVIOUS DISCUSSION)</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION ON THE MASTER PLANNING PROPOSAL</b></p>	
	<p>CN addressed the Committee and advised that he has received endorsement from the director of PET to immediately develop Structure Master Plan for Hope Island region. It is imperative that there is substance for Structure Planning and ultimately, Council wants to support intended development to avoid substantial information requests in response to development applications.</p> <p>CN advised that from Council's perspective, the deliverables to be achieved by the Structure Master Plan are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Principal road layout network;</li> <li>b) Conceptual stormwater management plan;</li> <li>c) Open space management and network system;</li> <li>d) Water and sewerage network;</li> <li>e) Fill master plan;</li> <li>f) Indication on how land uses will work;</li> <li>g) How much will it cost and how will it be funded?</li> </ol> <p>CN noted that he is currently at the point of briefing external consultants (in fact draft brief has been prepared). Accordingly, the timing prompted CN to request GY to bring forward Committee meeting to today.</p> <p>CN sought endorsement from the Committee to engage the following consultants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Boyd Sergeant of Planit Consulting – Project Manager.</li> <li>2. Parsons Brinckerhoff – collate all engineering factors and develop whollistic Structure Plan.</li> </ol>	

	<p>CN noted that PET are at liberty and have authority to appoint consultants (with all costs to be borne by developers by virtue by a special rate - Council resolution has been passed).</p> <p>CN proposed that Boyd Sergeant would be the liaison person with this Committee. CN noted that Boyd Sergeant had distanced himself from projects where potential existed for conflict of interest.</p> <p>It was resolved that Boyd would attend weekly meetings, commencing next Monday, 30 June 2003.</p> <p>Developers present undertook to provide Boyd with complete access to their consultants and data to ensure he is quickly and efficiently acquainted with region generally.</p> <p>Resolve – Committee endorsed appointment of consultants.</p> <p>GY noted that Structure Plan will ultimately be adopted by Council.</p> <p>CH noted that EDMP would continue to give direction and guidance to Boyd Sergeant during course of his brief.</p> <p>Resolve –Committee will be given opportunity to raise views with Boyd Sergeant during his term as Project Manager of Hope Island Structure Plan.</p> <p>GY acknowledged that Boyd Sergeant’s brief remained a dynamic concept and would be adjusted via Council as necessary.</p> <p>It was noted that the new Town Plan would be implemented on 17 August 2003. If deficiencies are identified in Town Plan, the Committee would discuss strategies to address same and assist with implementation of such strategies.</p> <p>Resolve – move towards implementation of Structure Plan and then consider the development of an LAP.</p>	<p>CN to invite Boyd Sergeant to attend next meeting</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b></p>	
	<p>Resolve - include item on agenda for next week’s meeting in relation to Hope Island Canal, Sickle Avenue Bridge (vehicular) and Sickle Avenue Foot Bridge. .</p> <p>CS discussed timing briefly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commencement of vehicle bridge expected to occur in September 2003.</li> <li>• Completion of vehicle bridge (including road alignments) expected May 2004.</li> </ul> <p>CG requested latest version of time frame for the construction of bridge and road alignment from CS. CS provided hard copy of time table. CG requested that a soft copy be e-mailed to him.</p>	<p>CS to provide soft copy of timetable to CG for review by Aurora consultants</p>

	<p>MA noted that in meeting conducted on 10 June 2003 between Council Officers, Aurora representatives and KBR, general agreement reached that bridge and road alignments could be completed by March 2004.</p> <p>GY: • Committee needs to decide philosophically on road heights for Hope Island region.</p> <p>CH standard is Q 100 less 300ml.</p> <p>GY requested MP also include item on next weeks agenda viz the new park in Sickle Avenue. A Council officer from parks will be required to attend next week to discuss. GY foreshadowed there are some changes to the proposed park.</p> <p>AR noted that he has spoken with CH regarding design of Sickle Avenue Footbridge. AR has also spoken with adjoining land owners who have consented to design. SH will table design for footbridge at next meeting.</p> <p>Canal related infrastructure / general infrastructure – CH explained briefly. Resolve - Resolve - SH will prepare and provide overview of these charges at next Committee meeting.</p>	<p>MP to invite Parks officer next week</p> <p>SH to present designs of Footbridge</p> <p>SH to provide summary of applicable infrastructure charges</p>
--	--	--

**MINUTES OF HOPE ISLAND STRUCTURE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MEETING NO. 1**

Deleted: MASTER  
Deleted: STEERING  
Formatted

DATE	23 June 2003
TIME START:	2:30pm
TIME FINISHED:	4:00pm
LOCATION:	Room 1, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
PRESENT:	<p>Councillor Alan Rickard - Chairman ("AR")</p> <p>Greg Young - Gold Coast City Council - Director EDMP ("GY")</p> <p>Rob Alcock - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("RA")</p> <p>Ceinwen Hooper - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("CH")</p> <p>Steve Harrison - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("SH")</p> <p>Chris Netherway - Gold Coast City Council - PET ("CN")</p> <p>Chris Stephens - Gold Coast City Council - Engineering Services ("CS")</p> <p>David Montgomery - Gold Coast City Council - City Solicitor ("DM")</p> <p>Craig Gore - Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("CG")</p> <p>Michael Adamson - Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("MA")</p> <p>John Fish - Fish Developments Pty Ltd ("JF")</p> <p>Edwin Yu ("EY")</p> <p>Gerard Cassar ("GC")</p>

Deleted: v

**AGENDA ITEMS:**

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	<p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>AR introduced each individual present.</p>	
2.	<p><b>FORMATION AND PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE (CHARTER, STATUS, ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, MEETING SCHEDULE ETC)</b></p> <p>GY informed the Committee that Council was about to embark upon a process to develop a Structure Plan for the Hope Island region and that the Committee meeting was brought forward to today to ensure that a decision could be made on the appointment of a consultant to undertake the Plan. PET is responsible for facilitating the process. GY explained that the purpose of this Committee was to ensure that a Structure Plan was developed for the Hope Island region which complemented the standard of development being pursued by developers in</p>	

Deleted: this week. For this reason,

Deleted: conducting

Deleted: Master

<p>the region.</p> <p>CG commented that the purpose of the Committee was to also ensure that a coordinated approach was undertaken by all relevant Council departments to facilitate the efficient development of the region.</p> <p>The Committee will also be responsible to confer with State agencies (such as the Main Roads Department) to achieve the objectives of the Committee. CG explained that he had spoken with the Minister for Main Roads who was endeavouring to deal with a number of issues which would facilitate Eddie Peters ability to attend the Committee meetings and contribute positively.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Committee should not seek to obtain "advisory committee" status as this would require Council approval.</p> <p>It was resolved that MA was to refine an informal Charter for the Committee for consideration by the Committee next week.</p> <p>It was further resolved that Major Projects would be charged with the responsibility of administering the Committee (so far as other Council departments were concerned).</p> <p>Further, it was resolved that:</p> <p>a) Major Projects <u>is</u> to be involved in all facets of the Committee's activities to the extent that Council is involved in the process;</p> <p>b) RA is to be the single point of accountability on behalf of Major Projects.</p> <p>AR announced that he is willing to continue to Chair the weekly Committee meetings (and in his absence, GY is to Chair the meetings).</p> <p>GY agreed to remain a member of the Committee (and Chair the meetings in the event of AR's unforeseen absence).</p> <p>After a brief discussion regarding the inclusion of additional Council officers on the Committee, it was resolved that the Committee would proceed on an "as needs" basis to mitigate over supply of Council resources.</p> <p>It was further resolved that where an agenda item anticipated the involvement of a Council department or officer not involved with the Committee, Major Projects <u>is</u> responsible to ensure relevant officers <u>are</u> in attendance at relevant Committee meeting.</p> <p>CG expressed surprise with Noel Pearson's absence. It was noted that <u>CN</u> represented PET.</p> <p>AR will advise Council Co-ordination Meeting on Friday 27 June 2003 of the formation of the Committee and seek appropriate</p>	<p>MA to refine basic Charter of Committee</p> <p>AR to advise Co-ord of formation of C/ee and seek sanction</p>
--	--

Deleted: -

Deleted: are

Deleted: about whether it was necessary to involve Gold Coast Water i

Deleted: is

Deleted: ed

Deleted: are

Deleted: to be

Deleted: W

Deleted: , despite being from the sub-divisions section



	<p>sanction for the Committee.</p> <p>CG undertook to keep following parties (as reference parties) updated in relation to the progress achieved by the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sanctuary Cove</li> <li>• Hope Island Resort</li> <li>• Riverlinks</li> <li>• State Government (and in particular Peta-Kaye Croft).</li> </ul> <p>JF undertook to keep following parties (as reference parties) updated in relation to the progress achieved by the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hope Island Canal Association</li> <li>• Neumann's - dredging contractor</li> </ul> <p>Resolved that Committee would meet every Monday at 2:30pm (until Committee decides alternate intervals for meetings).</p> <p>It was further resolved that all Agenda items to be submitted to RA and/or SH by Friday immediately preceding weekly meeting for inclusion on Agenda for following Monday's meeting. Agenda to be distributed by SH via email on Monday morning preceding weekly meeting.</p>	<p>RA and SH to manage administration of meetings</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>PROJECT CO-ORDINATION</b> (COVERED IN PREVIOUS DISCUSSION)</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION ON THE MASTER PLANNING PROPOSAL</b></p>	
	<p>CN addressed the Committee and advised that he has received endorsement from the director of PET to immediately commence a Structure Plan for Hope Island region. He stated that it is imperative that there is a coordinated approach to the Structure Planning and ultimately, Council wants to ensure that there is widespread support for intended development. It is envisaged that this will avoid substantial information requests in response to development applications.</p> <p>CN advised that from Council's perspective, the deliverables to be achieved by the Structure Master Plan are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Principal road layout network;</li> <li>b) Conceptual stormwater management plan;</li> <li>c) Open space management and network system;</li> <li>d) Water and sewerage network;</li> </ol>	<p>Deleted: develop</p> <p>Deleted: Master</p> <p>Deleted: l</p> <p>Deleted: substance for</p> <p>Deleted: to</p>

<p>e) Fill master plan;                  f) Indication on how land uses will work;                  g) How much will it cost and how will it be funded?</p> <p>CN noted that he is currently at the point of briefing external consultants (in fact draft brief has been prepared). Accordingly, the timing prompted CN to request GY to bring forward Committee meeting to today.</p> <p>CN sought endorsement from the Committee to engage the following consultants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Boyd Sergeant of Planit Consulting - Project Manager.</li> <li>2. Parsons Brinckerhoff - collate all engineering factors and develop a <u>wholistic</u> Structure Plan.</li> </ol>	
<p>CN noted that PET <u>has delegated authority to appoint consultants.</u></p> <p>CN proposed that Boyd Sergeant would be the liaison person with this Committee. CN noted that Boyd Sergeant had distanced himself from projects where potential existed for conflict of interest.</p> <p>It was resolved that Boyd would attend weekly meetings, commencing next Monday, 30 June 2003.</p> <p>Developers present undertook to provide Boyd with complete access to their consultants and data to ensure he is quickly and efficiently acquainted with region generally.</p> <p>Resolved - Committee endorsed <u>the appointment of consultants.</u></p>	<p>CN to invite Boyd Sergeant to attend next meeting</p>
<p>GY noted that <u>once the Structure Plan was approved by the Committee, it would then be adopted by Council.</u></p> <p>CH noted that EDMP would continue to give direction and guidance to Boyd Sergeant during course of his brief.</p> <p><u>The Committee requested that it be given opportunity to raise views with Boyd Sergeant during his term as Project Manager of Hope Island Structure Plan.</u></p> <p>GY acknowledged that Boyd Sergeant's brief <u>was dynamic and would be adjusted where necessary by Major Projects.</u></p> <p>It was noted that the new Town Plan <u>had already been approved by Council and would be enacted by the State Government on 17 August 2003.</u> If deficiencies are identified in Town Plan, the Committee would discuss strategies to address same and assist with implementation of such strategies.</p>	

Deleted: l

Deleted: are at liberty and

Deleted: ve

Deleted: (with all costs to be borne by developers by virtue by a special rate - Council resolution has been passed)

Deleted: will ultimately

Deleted: Resolve -

Deleted: will

Deleted: remained a

Deleted: concept

Deleted: via Council as necessary

Deleted: implemented

## **Structure Planning Committee (Public/Private Alliance Committee)**

### **Reason for the Committee set-up:**

In acknowledgement that the general intent of the Development Control Plan is now being realised with the construction of the Hope Island Canal, several issues are now emerging which require a consensual approach of Council, developers and the community in order to achieve a desirable urban form for the area benefited by the Hope Island Canal.

### **Global objective:**

A forum to provide guidance, co-ordination and advice to facilitate the development of a Structure Plan for the Hope Island region which compliments the standard of development being pursued by developers in the region.

### **Operational objectives:**

1. To set realistic goals so as to achieve the above global objective in a reasonable timeframe, including delegation of research/reporting to Committee members (at no cost to Council);
2. The deliverables to be achieved by the Structure Plan for Hope Island are as follows:
  - a) Principal road layout network;
  - b) Conceptual stormwater management plan;
  - c) Open space management and network system;
  - d) Water and sewerage network;
  - e) Fill master plan;
  - f) Indication on how land uses will work;
  - g) How much will it cost and how will it be funded?

### **Membership of Committee / Structure:**

Chair: Cr. Alan Rickard (GCCC);

Committee: Greg Young (GCCC - director EDMP)  
Rob Alcock (GCCC - EDMP)  
Steve Harrison (GCCC - EDMP)  
Chris Netherway (GCCC - PET)  
Chris Stephens (GCCC - Engineering Services)  
Craig Gore - Aurora Developments P/L  
Michael Adamson - Legal Counsel to Aurora Developments P/L  
John Fish - Fish Developments P/L  
Edwin Yu  
Gerrard Cassar  
Eddie Peters - District Director Main Roads (to be invited by Craig Gore)

Reference parties: Neumann's  
External consultants (including KBR)  
Hope Island Canal Association Inc

Sanctuary Cove  
Hope Island Resort  
Riverlinks  
State Government (and in particular the Hon Peta-Kaye Croft)

**Meetings:**

Weekly at 2.30pm (At Council Chambers - Nerang).

**Membership of Committee:**

Committee represents cross sectional interests from public and private sectors. Committee not to be enlarged or modified without unanimous resolution of the Committee.

**Administration of Committee:**

Major Projects are responsible for the administration of the Committee.

# Minutes

## HOPE ISLAND Masterplanning Committee Meeting No. 2

<b>DATE</b>	30 June 2003
<b>TIME START:</b>	2:30pm
<b>TIME FINISHED:</b>	3:25pm
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Room 5, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
<b>PRESENT:</b>	Councillor Alan Rickard – Chairman (“AR”) Greg Young – Gold Coast City Council - Director EDMP (“GY”) Paul Herd – Manager Major Projects (“PH”) Steve Harrison – Gold Coast City Council – EDMP (“SH”) Chris Netherway – Gold Coast City Council – PET (“CN”) Mark Reynolds – Gold Coast City Council – Engineering Services (“MR”) Richard Pascoe – Gold Coast City Council – Parks (“RP”) Noel Pearson – Gold Coast City Council – Transport (“NP”) Michael Adamson – Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd (“MA”) John Fish – Fish Developments Pty Ltd (“JF”) Boyd Sergeant – Planit Consulting (“BS”) Gerard Cassar (“GC”)
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	Craig Gore – Aurora Developments Pty Ltd Edwin Yu Rob Alcock – Gold Coast City Council Chris Stephens – Gold Coast City Council

### AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<b>PRELIMINARY</b>	
	AR acknowledged minutes circulated from meeting No. 1 held 23 June 2003. Resolve: Committee accepted minutes circulated as accurate.	
<b>1.</b>	<b>BRIDGES/ROADS</b>	
	MA apologised for CG's absence (which was unexpected as a result of unforeseen circumstances arising before commencement of meeting). MA queried whether soft copy of time frame for construction of Sickle Avenue bridge was sent to CG as per minutes of meeting No. 1.	

	<p>MR was unaware.</p> <p>MA to follow up Council to ensure timetable for construction of Sickie Avenue bridge is emailed to CG during course of this week.</p> <p>Resolve: CG to engage relevant consultants to analyse timetable during course of this week and report to Committee next week in relation to timeframe.</p> <p>SH reported that KBR is offsetting the Sickie Avenue bridge to account for the provision of a single 2.5 metre wide footpath on the eastern side of the bridge. This will alter the road alignment slightly and has been taken into consideration by KBR.</p> <p>MR advised that such changes would not affect timetable for design work being undertaken by KBR.</p> <p>SH further noted that KBR was designing bridge to accommodate road height of Q100 less 300mm. Once this point has been fixed, this will enable adjoining developments to tie in.</p>	<p>CG to provide comments on timetable at next meeting</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p><b>PARKS</b></p> <p>RP was invited to address the Committee to discuss plans for Council park in Sickie Avenue and Council's expectations in relation to open space dedications generally.</p> <p>RP advised that there were two main stream considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Facilities</li> <li>b) Open space provision (based on percentage of hectares per 1,000 residents).</li> </ul> <p>Based on a projected population of 1,400 residents, Council will be seeking to achieve 7 hectares of open space.</p> <p>Council prefers large consolidated park areas rather than a number of smaller 'pocket' parks.</p> <p>GY queried whether Council was philosophically looking for open space linkages on canal fronting lands.</p> <p>RP responded that Council was keen to maximise access in certain areas.</p> <p>AR noted that developers were liable to pay significant infrastructure charges, and further acknowledged that value in land holdings comes from land sales. Obviously canal fronting land provides means of valuable returns for developers.</p>	

JF noted that most developers would strongly argue for financial contributions in lieu of park dedications (where applicable). JF further pointed out the sizeable Council park in Sickle Avenue, which could be greatly enhanced by developer contributions.

RP reported with respect to Council's park in Sickle Avenue:

- Tennis facilities were being transferred;
- Balance area will accommodate sporting facilities (no pre-determined preference);
- Not intended to be formal area for a club (given formal facilities at Coomera, Runaway Bay and Monterey Keys);

JF encouraged Council to look closely at demographics of region – development will probably accommodate baby boomers.

The Committee embraced the following features in Council park:

- Playground equipment;
- Bike-way linkages;
- Extensive lighting (for night access);
- Extensive nose in parking along Sickle Avenue;
- No dedicated oval for particular sporting pursuit.

AR moved that Council formulate a specific policy with respect to park dedications. This was supported generally by the Committee.

JF noted that developers made significant contributions to canal to form part of flood mitigation scheme which reduced average 1 hectare blocks to 8700 sq metres.

CN noted that open space can have a number of functions apart from the obvious:

- a) viewing corridor;
- b) storm water management.

JF further noted that master plan shows one park only in region, being the Council park in Sickle Avenue.

RP advised that Parks wanted to see more open space dedications which accommodate passive recreational pursuits rather than sporting.

AR suggested Council determine extent of parks it can legally expect to achieve, and once this had been determined, any ideal linkages can be considered.

Resolve: Parks to formulate specific policy viz open space dedications, which is to be submitted to BS for presentation to the Committee.

RP / BS to  
prepare  
policy on  
open space  
dedications

AR invited Committee to suggest names for the Council park in Sickle Avenue. AR prefers to see park named now rather than later.  
Resolve: Committee to consider further.

AR advised Committee that he had viewed preliminary sketches of Council park in Sickle Avenue which illustrated:

- a) Positioning of tennis courts;
- b) Access road with an alignment on the eastern side of the park.

The access road may accommodate ultimate access for adjoining land holdings. This needs to be considered.

AR noted that the Council park has extensive frontage to Hope Island Canal. Committee agreed that park should not be loaded up with infrastructure. It was noted that park may need fencing around perimeter.

JF raised issue of parking and encouraged nose in angle parking in Sickle Avenue. Park should be of a high standard, and should be at least equivalent to exceptional park recently viewed by JF in Hope Island Resort (same park is accessible to public) which included:

- a) sealed walking area;
- b) children play apparatus

AR noted that if Council park was too large and formal, it would invite club to approach Council to secure tenure.

JF noted that the park had a frontage to Sickle Avenue in the order of 200 metres and should accommodate at least 50 cars.

Resolve: reduce oval to junior size and explore the opportunity for angle parking with as many car spaces as possible in Sickle Avenue (given positioning of roundabout in Sickle Avenue and ultimate access to Sanctuary Cove).

JF offered to prepare two schemes for Council park in Sickle Avenue which will be presented next week.

JF advised Committee that an internal road may provide a more efficient means of developing properties fronting canal - to this end the design of park is important. JF informed Committee that the land holdings adjacent to park would be available to commence construction by the end of September 2003 - steps should be taken to ensure construction of road is not a fragmented process.

JF to prepare two concept schemes for park in Sickle Avenue.



	<p>GY supported comments by JF and noted that Council originally received applications from individual one hectare allotments which contemplated cul-de-sacs to achieve development – of course this provided no connectivity. GY further stated that the aim of preparing a structure plan was to provide a coordinated approach to development in the area.</p> <p>MA reiterated that Aurora Developments Pty Ltd would make available any information required by BS in developing Structure Plan (including projected populations) and invited JF to offer similar support. JF agreed.</p> <p>Resolve: BS to contact a representative from Aurora Developments Pty Ltd and Fish Developments Pty Ltd in relation to data as and when required.</p> <p>NP noted that it may be possible to construct road in one hit.</p>	<p>MA and JF to e-mail BS and provide details for nominated representative who can be contacted freely by BS.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>CONTRIBUTION SCHEDULE</b></p>	
	<p>SH presented to Committee material summarising contribution charges.</p> <p>SH stated that costs for the canal related infrastructure (i.e. canal construction, acquisition of land, bridges, professional fees, and royalty for sand) would be recouped via a special rate on canal fronting landowners.</p> <p>SH further stated that an additional contribution that is imposed during the development approval process would be required over a wider area to provide funds for the acquisition of land for roads, park development, etc.</p> <p>The Committee noted the information.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>REVISED CHARTER</b></p>	
	<p>MA briefly discussed purpose and nature of the revised Charter for the Committee.</p> <p>Resolve – charter for the Committee accepted with the ability to vary it in the future as required.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p><b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b></p>	
	<p><b>A) Pedestrian Bridge</b></p> <p>SH presented preferred plan of Pedestrian bridge to Committee which illustrated embankment ramp on either side of canal. This plan contemplates a six metre AHD clearance above Hope Island Canal.</p>	

	<p>Councillor Rickard confirmed that he consulted with the residential property owners on the northern side of the Hope Island Canal who raised no objection with the design.</p> <p><b>B) Introduction of Boyd Sergeant</b></p> <p>CN introduced Boyd Sergeant who will now attend Committee meetings on a weekly basis.</p> <p>BS advised Committee that he expected the structure of the plan to be developed in approximately two months.</p> <p>MA and JF invited BS to attend the sites of Aurora and Fish Developments to gain better appreciation of issues being confronted by developers. BS agreed.</p> <p><b>C) Extent of Involvement by Department of Main Roads</b></p> <p>MA reported that CG has spoken with Minister for Main Roads (the Honorable Steve Bredhauer), Eddie Peters and the local member, Peta-Kaye Croft in relation to the objectives of the Committee. MA reported that CG had been informed that the Minister was still in the process of finalising a number of issues which would enable Main Roads representative (Eddie Peters) to attend Committee meetings.</p> <p>In anticipation of obtaining the support of Main Roads, MA reported that CG had approached Sanctuary Cove in relation to formulation of a proposal to raise funds which could be applied towards the expedition of the Hope Island Road upgrade between the M1 Motorway and Paradise Point. He stated that Sanctuary Cove would support such a proposal.</p> <p><b>D) Council Recess</b></p> <p>AR noted that Council was in recess next week and invited GY to chair Committee in AR's absence. GY agreed.</p> <p>Meeting closed</p>	<p>BS to arrange on-site meeting with Aurora and Fish Dev'ts</p> <p>CG will have further discussions with Minister for Main Roads, Eddie Peters and Peta-Kaye Croft to secure support of State Gov't to work with Committee.</p>
--	---	--

# Agenda

## HOPE ISLAND Masterplanning Committee Meeting No. 3

7 July 2003  
2:30 pm  
Council Chambers  
Level 1, Room 5, Gold Coast City Council  
Nerang - Southport Road, Nerang

Item No	Agenda Topics
1	Previous Minutes
2	Introduction to Peta-Kaye Croft & Eddie Peters
3	Road Infrastructure
4	Integration with State Main Roads
4	Sickle Avenue Bridge - Timetable
5	Open Space
6	General Business

# Minutes

## HOPE ISLAND Masterplanning Committee

DATE	7 July 2003
TIME START:	2:30pm
TIME FINISHED:	3:45pm
MEETING NO:	3
LOCATION:	Room 5, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
PRESENT:	Greg Young - Gold Coast City Council - Director EDMP ("GY") - Chairman Paul Herd - Gold Coast City Council - Manager Major Projects ("PH") Steve Harrison - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("SH") Chris Netherway - Gold Coast City Council - PET ("CN") Mark Reynolds - Engineering Services ("MR") Noel Pearson - Transport ("NP") Eddie Peters - District Director of Main Roads ("EP") Craig Gore - Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("CG") Michael Adamson - Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("MA") Adam Slijderink - Project Director for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("AS") John Fish - Fish Developments Pty Ltd ("JF") Boyd Sergeant - Planit Consulting PINIT ("BS") Gerard Cassar ("GC")
APOLOGIES	Councillor Alan Rickard ("AR") Peta-Kaye Croft ("PKC") Edwin Yu ("EY") Rob Alcock ("RA") Chris Stephens ("CS") Richard Pascoe - Parks ("RP")

### AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<b>PRELIMINARY - Chairman</b>	
	GY assumed chair in view of AR's absence during Council recess.	
1.	<b>PREVIOUS MINUTES</b>	
	GY acknowledge minutes circulated from meeting no. 2 held 30 June 2003.  Resolved: Committee accepted minutes circulated as accurate.	

2.	<p><b>INTRODUCTION TO PETA-KAYE CROFT AND EDDIE PETERS</b></p> <p>CG informed committee that Peta-Kaye Croft was engaged by an unexpected event and would not be able to attend this week.</p> <p>GY introduced EP to committee.</p>	
3 & 4	<p><b>ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE AND INTERGRATION WITH STATE MAIN ROADS</b></p>	
	<p>GY embarked upon a brief summary of the objectives of the committee for the benefit of EP.</p> <p>GY explained briefly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• history of fragmentation of development lots on Hope Island</li> <li>• nature of flood-prone land form</li> <li>• Hope Island Canal construction</li> <li>• development applications were being received by Council which require referral to State Agencies (including Main Roads)</li> <li>• Council limitations in giving approval and attaching conditions</li> <li>• concerns with coordination of all issues</li> <li>• realisation that Hope Island project needs wholistic approach, particularly given grouping of lands by number of developers</li> <li>• great opportunity exists to proceed in a co-ordinated way to achieve effective Structure Plan for Hope Island region</li> <li>• the committee is seeking to achieve better outcome for developers and Council by good planning</li> </ul> <p>GY introduced BS as the external consultant engaged by Council to project manage the preparation of the Structure plan during the course of the next two months and explained the role of BS as an interface with the committee.</p> <p>CG explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CG and JF generally represent other land holders and interested parties including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sanctuary Cove</li> <li>Hope Island Resort</li> <li>Riverlinks</li> <li>Hope Island Canal Association</li> <li>Neumann's - dredging contractor</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CG and JF had spoken to the abovenamed parties and kept them informed in relation to the matters being discussed by the committee. Specifically, all parties are aware of the proposal to accelerate the upgrading of Hope Island Road between Paradise Point Bridge and the M1 Motorway.</li> </ul>	
	<p>EP acknowledged and advised that he would play role to ensure the protection of State Government interests.</p> <p>EP specifically stated that he had a real interest in Main road section</p>	

	from Sanctuary Cove roundabout to Paradise Point Bridge.	
5.	<b>SICKLE AVENUE BRIDGE - TIMETABLE</b>	
	<p>CG introduced AS as an internal consultant of Aurora who had reviewed the timetable presented by Council.</p> <p>AS indicated he was unclear about where things currently stood.</p> <p>MR advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Council had reviewed bridge drawings last week;</li> <li>b) Council were yet to receive the civil drawings from KBR.</li> </ul> <p>AS assumed for the purpose of discussion that the timetable had generally been met to date.</p> <p>AS identified the following two matters as a means of expediting the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Bring forward tender process for construction of the bridge by pursuing Expressions of Interest.</li> </ul> <p>This would result in a short-listing of parties to say four preferred parties. GY stated that under the Local Government Act this would require a Council resolution.</p> <p>AS stated that it would be prudent to start costing process now. MR noted that Council already has an estimate of cost for the bridge. CG stated that he would like a copy of the cost estimate.</p> <p>AS further indicated that Council would only need half a day with preferred contractors to detail the Sickle Avenue bridge project. MR agreed in principle to AS' comments about Expressions of Interest.</p> <p>GY stated that the earliest date that Council could consider a report recommending Expressions of Interest (EOI) be invited would be 25 August 2003. The committee noted this and suggested that the use of an EOI process be investigated to determine if time could be saved.</p> <p>PH noted that an EOI process requires a 21 day period given that it will substitute tender process, and in principle, didn't object to using that process.</p> <p>CG noted that from a commercial prospective, further consideration needs to be given to running various aspects in timetable concurrently.</p> <p>Resolve: SH to explore Expressions of Interest process and determine if time can be saved as a consequence of implementation of such a process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) Council to engage KBR for entire project as managers.</li> </ul>	<p>SH to provide to all committee members estimate of cost.</p> <p>SH to report to Committee viz expression of interest process.</p>

	<p>GY noted that Council under the Local Government Act would have immediate concern regarding KBR being a "sole supplier". GY explained Council would need to justify why KBR was the sole supplier that could do the work and would be required to explain this decision to any third party objectors.</p> <p>PH highlighted that there was a real potential for conflict of interest issues if the designer of the bridge was also the superintendent.</p> <p>Resolve: Committee would not pursue this issue any further.</p>	
6.	<b>OPEN SPACE</b>	
	<p>BS noted apology for Richard Pascoe (from the Parks Section) who contacted him 30 minutes before commencement of meeting to advise that he could not attend.</p> <p>BS reported that Council would be seeking to achieve four hectares of open space per 1000 people.</p> <p>BS further explained that Community Services identified park in Sickle Avenue as a future sporting requirement.</p> <p>NP informed the committee that Engineering Services has layouts of the proposed roundabout at Sickle Avenue and that the location of the roundabout had already been taken into consideration during the design of the bridge to ensure a coordinated approach.</p> <p>BS stated to committee that Council's policy for open space dedications would be as per Land Development Guidelines (with a general acknowledgement there was room for interpretation.)</p> <p>GY expressed disappointment that a representative from Parks was not present at meeting to discuss this important issue, particularly given the inclusion of "Open Space" as an agenda item.</p> <p>GY undertook to raise the matter with the Director Community Services to ensure representation from the Parks Section at future meetings.</p> <p>JF responded to policy relayed by BS and informed committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Developers have already dedicated approximately 20% of the land parcels for the canal; and</li> <li>2. there is no need for further dedication given the size and location of park in Sickle Avenue.</li> </ol> <p>GY advised no comment could be made without a representative from the Parks section being present.</p> <p>CN queried whether future development would include open space.</p> <p>CG responded by noting that this issue would be dependant upon whether a development was gated or not (ie public or private).</p>	

CG noted that provision of further contributions to open space would be difficult, particularly given net loss of land areas as a consequence of land dedications to Council to form part of the Hope Island Canal.

JF supported CG's position and informed committee that it would be difficult for developers to achieve developments of excellence without clear direction in respect to this matter.

BS announced that he was meeting with various Council officers tomorrow to discuss the following mainstream issues:

1. Future demand for open space.
2. Intended users (public or private).
3. Quality versus quantity.

CN noted that the Land Development Guidelines provided rules with respect to various matters which applied in the absence of other rules. In any event, Council can determine extent of open space requirements (plan will ultimately go to Council).

Resolve: issues relating to open space to be further discussed next week when representative from Parks in attendance.

MR noted that the road embankment (extending from bridge) spills into park in Sickle Avenue. It was proposed the other embankments would constitute concrete walls. The embankment spilling into Sickle Avenue park will have a one in four gradient and will be mowable. MR sought confirmation from committee that this was not objectionable.

Resolved: committee accepted proposed embankment in Sickle Avenue park.

BS commented that Parks needed to see effect of road design, and bike links may need to be looked at by Community Services.

JF distributed a "mud map" of proposed layout of Sickle Avenue park.

JF informed the committee that Council had already awarded the contract for construction of tennis court pads.

PH confirmed that a contract had been awarded by Council as an undertaking had been given to relocate the tennis courts prior to commencement of dredging works in Section A (outlet of canal) and the removal of the existing tennis courts.

JF stated that he had spoken to HICA and advised them to put the works on hold so that further discussion can occur. JF stated that he wanted to ensure that the proposed road reserve from his plan, which runs in a north-south direction on the eastern boundary of park, is not compromised.

Again, comments are required by Council's Parks Section on this

BS undertook to report outcome of meeting viz open space to GY.

PH to review this matter to ensure all issues properly addressed

Parks to provide



	<p>plan.</p> <p>Discussion ensued on the standard of the roads in the area.</p> <p>NP confirmed that the small roundabout on Sickle Avenue adjacent to art and craft village needs to be increased substantially (maybe by three times the existing size) if Sickle Avenue is duplicated.</p> <p>CG insisted that it was now an opportunity to look at roads in the area carefully as well as those which will service park/s.</p> <p>EP noted that there would need to be a transport plan developed for this area, which would look at all forms of transport (including public transport).</p> <p>NP noted that Council will be addressing pedestrians, cycles, marine precinct, &amp; Sanctuary Cove access as part of transport plan.</p> <p>CN informed committee that the first meeting of Council officers to develop a Structure Plan for the Hope Island Canal precinct is scheduled for tomorrow (8 July 2003). The purpose of the meeting is to identify all relevant issues. BS indicated that it was not necessary for a Main Roads representative to be in attendance.</p> <p>Resolved: BS to keep committee regularly informed of all issues discussed by Council officers through entire process.</p> <p>EP raised concerns about access off Hope Island Road in the section between Oyster Cove roundabout and Paradise Point Bridge - Main Roads does not want to see individual accesses.</p> <p>BS responded and noted that LAP has provided a service road along easterly section of road. NP reiterated BS comment. It was suggested that the Committee provides input in order that appropriate prioritisation of roads/service roads is considered.</p> <p>CG supported this and reiterated the desire for acceleration of road upgrade and avoidance of individual road accesses.</p>	<p>comment on JF plan for Sickle Avenue park.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b></p>	
	<p><u>Email Exchanges</u>          BS raised issue of e-mail exchanges. Generally, all e-mail communication should be circulated amongst all members of committee.</p> <p>Committee also resolved that SH was to be sole point of contact with Council with respect to the conduct of the committee.</p> <p><u>Bridge - aesthetics - vertical wall embankments</u>          SH sought acknowledgement of committee that the concrete wall embankments would be vertical, plain concrete, graffiti protection with a wave or pattern.</p> <p>Resolved: Committee agreed and raised no objection.</p>	

<p><u>Sanctuary Cove/Hope Island Resort</u> CG confirmed Sanctuary Cove and Hope Island Resort had been kept informed in relation to activities of committee. CG further confirmed discussions in relation to levy concept to raise funds to accelerate upgrading of road.</p> <p><u>AR and GY absent next week</u> GY advised that AR and GY would be absent next week. PH was appointed to chair meeting in their absence.</p> <p>Meeting closed.</p>	
---	--

# Minutes

## HOPE ISLAND Masterplanning Committee

DATE	21 July 2003
TIME START:	2:30pm
TIME FINISHED:	3:45pm
MEETING NO:	5
LOCATION:	Room 5, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
PRESENT:	Greg Young - Gold Coast City Council Director - EDMP ("GY") Steve Harrison - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("SH") Rob Alcock - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("RA") Mark Reynolds - Engineering Services ("MR") Richard Pascoe - Gold Coast City Council - Parks ("RP") Noel Pearson - Gold Coast City Council - Transport ("NP") Chris Stevens - Gold Coast City Council - Engineering Services ("CS") Michael Adamson - Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("MA") Adam Slijderink - Project Director for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("AS") John Fish - Fish Developments Pty Ltd ("JF") Boyd Sergeant - Planit Consulting ("BS")
APOLOGIES	Councillor Alan Rickard ("AR") Craig Gore - ("CG") Edwin Yu ("EY") Gerard Cassar ("GC") Paul Herd - ("PH") Eddie Peters - ("EP") Chris Netherway - ("CN")

### AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	PRELIMINARY - Chairman	
	GY assumed chair in view of AR's absence.	
1.	PREVIOUS MINUTES	
	GY acknowledged minutes circulated from meeting held 14 July 2003.	
	Resolved: Committee accepted minutes circulated as accurate.	

<p>2.</p>	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE PARK</b></p> <p>RP reported that a site inspection was conducted last week at Hope Island with CG and JF, which looked at parks in the area.</p> <p>RP further reported that CN had provided advice to Aurora Developments regarding the status of the plan for Sickle Avenue Park. CN advised that the plan (which contemplates service road outside boundaries of park) had been signed off by the relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>SH advised that the outcome of the court case involving Lot 218 was that there would be public linkages to and from the park (including pedestrian/bike access) and to properties to the east.</p> <p>SH also highlighted that the pads for the tennis courts are in process of being constructed.</p> <p>NP stated that it would be better from a traffic management perspective to have park access from the road in Lot 218 (i.e. from the road that would link with properties to the east).</p> <p>BS noted that a consent order concerning Lot 218 could be entertained by Council and the proprietor of Lot 218 to achieve repositioning of the road access.</p> <p>GY queried whether JF was prepared to meet cost to move tennis court pads. JF replied in the affirmative.</p> <p><b>Resolve:</b> JF to present a detailed plan next week (which includes angle or nose in car parking along access road running parallel to park and off Sickle Avenue) that satisfied Council's requirements.</p> <p>The road reserve width should be contemplated in the range of 16-20 metres.</p> <p><b>Further Resolve:</b> Committee agreed that a final decision must be made in respect to this issue next week and all relevant council officers with interest in matter to be in attendance.</p>	<p>JF to present detailed layout plan for park at next meeting</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE BRIDGE (GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES/TIME FRAME FOR COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION)</b></p>	
	<p>AS advised that the geotechnical report undertaken by Bowler Geotechnical and submitted by Council to Aurora identified the need for pre-loading. This therefore had the potential to delay the delivery of the bridge.</p> <p>AS advised committee that report required modeling in greater detail. AS highlighted that wicking would be required (in the location of the 12 metre thick marine clay bands) to accelerate settlement. AS explained wicking (generically)- straw pushed through ground to marine clays to allow extraction of water and consolidation of soil.</p> <p>AS further stated that to maintain the bridge construction program, the cost of wicks would be approximately \$35,000.00 (additional structural fill would also be required for preloading).</p> <p>General discussion ensued on options to address the geotechnical issues.</p>	

	<p>CS noted that the bridge involves enormously expensive infrastructure and to accelerate the construction process increases the exposure to risk.</p> <p>AS queried whether program had been revised. CS responded by stating that Council and KBR was still working towards complying with current program.</p> <p>AS proposed a meeting be convened between representatives of Aurora, its geotechnical engineers, Council, KBR and the geotechnical consultants to identify potential solutions.</p> <p><b>Resolve:</b> MR to arrange meeting between AS, KBR, Bowler Geotechnical, Soil Surveys (Aurora geotechnical engineers) and Council officers.</p>	Meeting to be held with relevant parties regarding geotechnical issues
4.	<b>SERVICE ROAD ALONG NORTHERN SIDE OF BROADWATER AVENUE</b>	
	<p>RA assumed chair (GY excused himself from meeting).</p> <p>JF informed the Committee that he intended to present a proposal to Eddie Peters from the Department of Main Roads today. Given EP's absence, it was resolved this item would be deferred for next week's meeting.</p>	JF to present proposal regarding the service road to EP at next weeks meeting
5.	<b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b>	
	<p><u>PARKS</u></p> <p>MA informed Committee that the issue of open space remains unresolved and is an issue which requires immediate consideration for the mutual benefit of Council officers and developers.</p> <p>The specific issues which require addressing include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Open space requirements - gated communities versus land sub-divisions;</li> <li>2. Financial contributions;</li> <li>3. Land development costs;</li> <li>4. Infrastructure charges already imposed on canal-fronting properties and other infrastructure charges;</li> <li>5. Council parks.</li> </ol> <p>Given that open space requirements are a deliverable under the Structure Plan, this item needs addressing as a matter of priority to assist developers preparing for DA process or are currently within DA process.</p> <p><u>LETTER FROM PETA-KAYE CROFT</u> SH submitted letter from Hon PK Croft for the Committee's review and consideration.</p>	Information to be noted for Structure Planning process.

Meeting Closed.

# Minutes

## HOPE ISLAND Masterplanning Committee

DATE	28 July 2003
TIME START:	2:00pm
TIME FINISHED:	3:45pm
MEETING NO:	6
LOCATION:	Room 5, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
PRESENT:	Councillor Alan Rickard ("AR") Peta-Kaye Croft - Honourable Member for Broadwater ("PK") Eddie Peters - Department of Main Roads ("EP") Greg Young - GCCC Director - EDMP ("GY") Steve Harrison - GCCC - EDMP ("SH") Rob Alcock - GCCC - EDMP ("RA") Richard Pascoe - GCCC Parks ("RP") Noel Pearson - GCCC Transport Planning ("NP") Chris Stephens - GCCC Eng Services ("CS") Craig Gore - Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("CG") Michael Adamson - Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("MA") Ross Heatley - Group Town Planner for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("AS") John Fish - Fish Developments Pty Ltd ("JF") Boyd Sergeant - Planet Consulting PINIT ("BS") Edwin Yu ("EY")
APOLOGIES	Mark Reynolds - Engineering Services ("MR") Gerard Cassar ("GC") Paul Herd - ("PH") Chris Netherway - ("CN")

### AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	PREVIOUS MINUTES	
	AR acknowledged minutes circulated from meeting held 21 July 2003.	
	Resolved: Committee accepted minutes circulated as accurate.	

2.	<b>SERVICE ROAD ALONG NORTHERN SIDE OF BROADWATER AVENUE</b>	
	<p>Discussion ensued regarding the service road connection from the Village Square roundabout through to Crescent Avenue (which will facilitate ingress/egress into the Hope Island Tavern).</p> <p>JF explained that the Village Square roundabout would need to be increased to accommodate service road connection. Access road off roundabout would create T intersection at service road which runs parallel to Broadwater Avenue. Arrangements will involve co-operation with DMR and owners to east of tavern.</p> <p>AR acknowledged that at next Council meeting motion being put to Council in respect of purchase of land to facilitate connection to Crescent Avenue.</p> <p>AR queried whether current access to tavern was temporary.</p> <p>EY responded - yes, existing access will be closed if access off service road finalised. JF noted that there would a left in only to access tavern.</p> <p>EP noted that DMR would need to investigate proposals to as part of the overall local road network. EP noted that DMR would be concerned about a right access out of tavern.</p> <p>PK has been involved in discussions in relation to access for tavern and is of the view that the service road will assist greatly.</p> <p>Committee acknowledged negotiations would need to ensue with DMR viz land owned by DMR to accommodate access off Village Square roundabout.</p> <p>AR noted that Council would need to review whether proposal requires any land dedication to accommodate service road. Given next council meeting on 22 August 2003, the co-ordination meeting will be on 15 August 2003, and at the following meeting of this committee on 18 August 2003 we will know outcome and will be able to resolve the issue of the service road.</p> <p>JF stated that Council should move to compulsorily acquire relevant lands to develop service road.</p> <p>On a separate matter, GY advised Committee that HICA has expressed concern that they were not being advised of the Committee's discussions. JF/CG gave an undertaking that they would inform / update all representative parties.</p> <p>CG reaffirmed that the purpose of committee is to progress and discuss substantive matters, and when appropriate, liaise with the reference parties.</p> <p>AR stated that it is important that the reference parties are updated with issues discussed by the Committee on a regular basis.</p> <p>CG gave further reassurance to keep reference parties informed. CG also stated that CG &amp; JF have been able to reconcile a number of issues as a consequence of their efforts in representing landowners generally in the area.</p>	

	<p>JF echoed the comments of CG and noted that the service road is a key issue and if proposal is met with any resistance from the community at large,</p> <p>AR noted that Council had a preferred outcome.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE PARKS - SICKLE AVENUE ROUNDABOUT</b></p>	
	<p>AR noted that he was desirous of the park being named as soon as possible.</p> <p>RP stated Council should recognise matters/people of local significance when deciding name.</p> <p>Resolve: RP will arrange for the relevant Council report to be prepared immediately to progress this matter.</p> <p>CG again raised concern regarding coordination of design for bridge and roundabout. SH noted NP presented plan a couple of weeks ago and the design of the bridge and the roundabout was coordinated. This was confirmed by CS.</p> <p>AR noted Council would defend parkland on Hope Island. Provision of park on Hope Island well below current Council standard.</p> <p>CG queried whether Sickle Avenue would sustain traffic movements after new Sanctuary Cove entry point in Sickle Avenue became operable. CG also expressed concerns regarding the geometry of the Sickle Avenue roundabout and the proposed road alignment.</p> <p>NP informed Committee that these matters will be analysed as part of the structure planning process.</p> <p>BS indicated that Parsons Brinckerhoff may need 5 weeks to consider traffic related matters in the overall context of structure planning.</p> <p>CS acknowledged that given the tapering of the road alignment to ground levels, this may create option to gain a better curve into roundabout adjacent to park.</p> <p>SH queried whether an estimation of traffic numbers could be provided in the interim.</p> <p>BS indicated concerns with potential densities. Parsons Brinckerhoff working along that path - but do not want to take an issue out of overall picture.</p> <p>EP stated that Council needed a comprehensive report outlining future demand on the road and that no decision should be made until report is finalised.</p>	<p>RP to prepare Council report to name park in Sickle Avenue</p> <p>NP to advise Committee of timeframe for identifying traffic movements.</p>



	<p>NP noted that Parsons Brinckerhoff were in the process of preparing this report.</p> <p>Resolved: NP to seek interim feedback from Parsons Brinckerhoff, if appropriate. NP to circulate design of roundabout at Sickie Avenue.</p>	
4.	<p><b>STRUCTURE PLAN - DENSITIES, HEIGHTS, COMMUNITY ACCESS, OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS</b></p>	
	<p>CG addressed committee and advised during course of last week his group (in consultation with JF) had studied Council's planning documentation and had developed conceptual land use plans.</p> <p>As far as open space is concerned, a comparison was undertaken between draft town plan (to commence on 18 August 2003) and existing town plan. It was noted that the new town plan scaled back a number of areas on Hope Island from 40 dwellings per hectare to 25 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>JF noted that development applications were being suspended as a consequence of the development of structure plan to ensure ultimate development to be pursued will be appropriate and complimentary to structure plan.</p> <p>RP confirmed that Parks wanted to create efficient use of parks with community.</p> <p>CG explained that a feature of the conceptual plans presented by Aurora was access and mobility. Aurora remains conscious that the provision of parks was still less than what is required, but to counter this densities could be increased in certain pockets to create additional open space.</p> <p>JF also highlighted that the proposal to secure financial contributions for park purposes needs to be discussed and the matter agreed upon. JF also explained that instead of sporting facilities attempts must be made to ensure passive use of such open space areas by residents.</p> <p>BS informed Committee that he met with developers last week (and architects) to discuss densities, heights and community access matters.</p> <p>BS stated that Parsons Brinckerhoff will be briefed in relation to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Density Pockets</li> <li>• Public Boardwalks</li> </ul> <p>These specific aspects will also be raised further with Council officers.</p> <p>GY noted that Council needed to adopt a conciliatory approach to ensure that a better outcome is achieved.</p>	

	<p>BS advised that the key issues would be discussed during the ongoing meetings between Council officers (including Parsons Brinckerhoff) and all issues will be considered in this forum.</p> <p>BS stated that he was meeting with Council's Parks Section tomorrow and will aim to identify initiatives that achieve Councils objectives.</p> <p>JF indicated that he is aiming to achieve a pedestrian link by construction of boardwalk along canal alignment.</p> <p>AR noted boardwalks are already in front of the Chancellor development (Hope Harbour) and that the general perception was there were no security risks as consequence of public boardwalks fronting such developments.</p> <p>The committee agreed that the provision of boardwalks could be incorporated into the Hope Island LAP (and be aligned with developer contributions schedule).</p> <p>Resolved: Aurora to give BS colour copies of the conceptual plans presented at the meeting.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE BRIDGE (GEOTECHINAL ISSUES AND TIME FRAME OF COMMENCEMENT OF BRIDGE)</b></p>	
	<p>MA informed the Committee that a meeting was held last Friday between Adam Slijderink (Project Director of Aurora Developments Pty Ltd) , Albert Rutten (Soil Surveys), Mark Reynolds (Engineering Services), Steve Harrison (Major Projects) and representatives of KBR.</p> <p>At meeting, it was resolved that :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adam Slijderink was to be regularly updated.</li> <li>2. Engineering Services were to undertake a review of wick drains.</li> <li>3. KBR to design wicks.</li> <li>4. KBR to prepare bill of quantities of wicks.</li> <li>5. Engineering Services to review timing process for construction of:</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to Sickle Avenue during construction (via a sidetrack)</li> <li>• Wicks</li> <li>• Bridge</li> </ul> <p>Decision in relation to time frame and construction of these items was to be completed by 1 August 2003. Council to notify relevant parties who were in attendance at meeting. JF reported that he was chasing proprietor of Lot 215 (Gregory) in relation to requirements of his land to facilitate construction of the bridge and access road.</p> <p>CS informed Committee that Council is considering separating works to allow pre works to commence. Geo-technical advice will have an impact, but design being progressed in parallel for:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preloading</li> <li>• Wicking</li> </ul>	<p>MR to advise Committee of outcome of investigations on geotechnical tests and timing issues.</p>

	<p>If process can be accelerated, Council will be advise Aurora. CG reassured Committee and Council officers that Aurora would apply resources to address certain issues if required.</p> <p>CS confirmed that a start was expected before 1 October 2003.</p> <p>CG requested costings on bridge.</p> <p>SH advised that he had received estimates for the pedestrian bridge from the consultants today. SH to compile information and forward to CG for review (costings included Sickle Avenue bridge and pedestrian foot bridge).</p>	<p>SH to provide bridge costings to CG asap</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b></p>	
	<p><u>TENNIS COURTS</u></p> <p>CS informed committee the tennis court contractor was on site on Saturday and was not satisfied with the fill material. Tennis court contractor required CBR30.</p> <p>JF reiterated the need for connectivity from the park to properties to the east. JF informed AR of solution which had been presented in previous weeks (ie move tennis courts 3m to the west and use 7m of council park and 13m of adjoining property ie Lot 218). This result would be more efficient and would provide nose-in parking on Council land.</p> <p>AR stated his concern on promoting the use of playing field and that area mat be able to be better utilised by the community.</p> <p>The issue of Sickle Avenue park was raised again with respect to positioning of tennis courts. It was noted that a last weeks meeting, it was resolved to present a plan for final decision.</p> <p>Resolve: That CG / JF prepare a detailed plan and submit to Council. CG further confirmed that JF would pay for positioning of fill for tennis court pads at CBR30 as required by tennis court contractor.</p> <p>CG/JF to prepare detailed plan for submission to the Council</p> <p><u>PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE</u></p> <p>JF presented a proposal for the pedestrian bridge at Crescent Avenue as an alternative to a concrete structure. JF met with Bellingham Marine rep last week and explored following two options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pedestrian cable ferry;</li> <li>2. Fixed pontoon either side with 75m gap</li> </ol> <p>Resolve: A copy of the plan sketching option 2 was left with Council for retention on file. JF/HICA to identify working example, brief Bellingham marine and address the Committee when appropriate.</p> <p>Next weeks meeting to commence at 2.30pm. Meeting closed</p>	<p>Fish Dev'ts/Aurora to prepare detailed plan viz positioning of tennis courts for submission to Council for approval</p>



# Minutes

## HOPE ISLAND Masterplanning Committee

DATE	4 August 2003
TIME START:	2:30pm
TIME FINISHED:	3:45pm
MEETING NO.	7
LOCATION:	Room 5, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
PRESENT:	Councillor Alan Rickard ("AR") Eddie Peters - ("EP") Greg Young - Gold Coast City Council Director - EDMP ("GY") Paul Herd - Gold Coast City Council- EDMP ("PH") Steve Harrison - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("SH") Rob Alcock - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("RA") Richard Pascoe - Gold Coast City Council - Parks ("RP") Noel Pearson - Gold Coast City Council - Transport ("NP") Chris Stephens Gold Coast City Council - Engineering Services ("CS") Michael Adamson - Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("MA") Ross Heatley - Group Town Planner for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("RH") Adam Slidjerink - Project Director for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("AS")
APOLOGIES	Craig Gore - Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("CG") Mark Reynolds - Engineering Services ("MR") Chris Netherway - ("CN") John Fish - ("JF") Boyd Sargeant - ("BS") Edwin Yu - ("EY") Gerard Cassar - ("GC")

### AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	PREVIOUS MINUTES	
	AR acknowledged minutes circulated from meeting held 28 July 2003.	
	Resolved: Committee accepted minutes circulated as accurate.	

2.	<b>UPGRADING OF HOPE ISLAND ROAD</b>	
	<p>This item was added to the agenda for today's meeting.</p> <p>EP notified the Committee of proposal for the establishment of a sub-committee (administered by DMR) to progress the future upgrading of Hope Island Road from M1 motorway to immediately west of Paradise Point Bridge (ie Jabiru Bridge).</p> <p>EP proposed that the sub-committee would report to the Hope Island Master Planning Committee viz upgrading of Hope Island Road. EP circulated a draft terms of reference for comment by Committee members.</p> <p>NP agreed to participate in the sub-committee as a representative of Council.</p> <p>AS noted that DMR needed approval before it can gain access to a flood model prepared by Lawson Treloar Engineers. SH responded that the relevant Council officers would be notified to provide information to ensure that the sub-committee could make informed decisions.</p> <p>Resolve: Establishment of sub-committee endorsed by the Hope Island Master Planning Committee. EP to contact MA in next week to set up first meeting of sub-committee.</p>	<p>EP to contact MA in next week to set up first meeting of sub-committee</p>
3.	<b>SPECIAL RATE FOR RECOUPING CANAL RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS</b>	
	<p>RA addressed committee and explained that this matter related to how Council recoups the cost of construction for Section A of the canal. The current scenario is vastly different from the scenario which existed at the time this issue was formalized, given that initially there were a large number of HICA members - there are now only approximately 8 land owners.</p> <p>Resolve: RA is to investigate this matter and report back to the Committee as to the timing of payment of the special rate (ie upon developer seeking sealing of sub-divisional plans or alternatively, at some later point ie settlement of sale of subdivided lots.</p>	
4.	<b>SALE OF SAND AGREEMENT</b>	
	<p>GY advised that HICA were not prepared to sign a sale of sand agreement to acquire sand material excavated from Section A of the canal at a rate of \$6 per sq metre. Despite extensive communication between Council and HICA regarding this issue, the agreement was not formalised. GY advised that currently there is not a strong market for fill material.</p> <p>GY noted that Council is now looking to sell sand material.</p> <p>GY highlighted that there is a potential short fall in funds if material is not sold and this would have to be borne by landowners. In particular, GY raised the potential for inequity between Section B and Section C / D landowners. In the circumstances, GY wanted to ensure an appropriate apportionment of costs.</p>	

	<p>MA queried whether AS required any fill material for Aurora lands. AS responded by noting it was a timing issue, but he would review his program and respond if there was any need for Aurora to require fill material.</p>	<p>AS to advise committee if Aurora could utilise any of the excess sand.</p>
5.	<p><b>AURORA'S COMMITMENT TO HOPE ISLAND</b></p> <p>MA addressed the Committee to clarify Aurora intentions and reaffirm its commitment to projects in the Hope Island area.</p> <p>MA announced that Aurora had entered into contractual negotiations with a third party who sought to purchase its land holdings on the western side of the Hope Island Canal. Under its contractual arrangements, Aurora will be required to deliver its land holdings filled and compacted, together with all infrastructure (including bridges at 6 metres aht, midway roundabout on Hope Island Road, and completion of Hope Island Canal to Santa Barbara Road end).</p> <p>GY stated that Council would be seeking contractual commitments to each of the projects (i.e. cost differential for the raising of the Sickie Avenue Bridge from 4.05 metres aht to 6 metres aht).</p> <p>AR acknowledged commitment and confirmed that he had been made aware that the sale by Aurora would remain conditional upon the completion of the canal and the raising of the bridges.</p>	<p>MA / GCCC to prepare contracts (where &amp; when appropriate) for the payment and construction of Hope Island projects</p>
6.	<p><b>ROAD CLOSURE OF PENDRAAT PARADE</b></p> <p>MA informed committee that Aurora had lodged an application for the closure of Pendraat Parade and that Council would consider a report on this matter on 8 August 2003. After Council approval, a submission would be made to DNR to enable the road closure application to proceed and be finalised.</p>	
7.	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE PARK - RELOCATION OF TENNIS COURTS (UPDATE)</b></p> <p>RH presented a concept plan prepared by Knobel Consulting which positioned tennis courts in accordance with the previous discussions of the Committee (i.e. 10 metres from the Sickie avenue road reserve).</p> <p>The plan illustrated bikeway on southern side of Sickie Avenue road reserve - which RH maintained was preferable to northern side as shown in town plan.</p> <p>RH indicated that lighting for the tennis courts can sometimes be a source of controversy.</p> <p>RP responded by stating that it will be necessary for lighting to meet Australian Standards (this requires appropriate shrouding and projection of lighting). RP reaffirmed that the positioning of the tennis courts shown on the concept plan is acceptable to the Parks Section.</p>	

	<p>AR noted that further landscaping could be achieved in front of tennis courts (similar to screening around pump station in Sickle Avenue).</p> <p>AS highlighted that the positioning of the courts on the concept plan will result in a 14 metre road dedication from the landowner of Lot 218 and a 6 metre requirement on Council's park.</p> <p>AR questioned the need for a fence along the canal front.</p> <p>RP noted that Council is to be aware of risk management issues in terms of the park fronting the canal.</p> <p>SH advised that only the clubhouse / amenity buildings will be raised to a Q100 level in the park, with the remainder of the park at a Q5 level for use as additional flood storage.</p> <p>Resolved - The Committee approved the proposed position of tennis courts as shown on the concept plan (everything else illustrated on plan indicative only).</p> <p>It was further resolved that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CS is to provide pad size to AS</li> <li>• AS to contact BradLees for survey data (SH has previously given direction to BradLees to provide all survey data to Aurora upon request).</li> <li>• Tennis courts to be located to avoid the sewer pump station.</li> <li>• Detailed plan to be forwarded to Engineering Services as soon as possible.</li> </ul> <p>No further Committee resolutions will be required.</p>	<p>CS to provide pad size to AS</p> <p>AS to contact BradLees for survey data and incorporate into detailed plan layout as soon as possible</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE BRIDGE</b></p>	
	<p>AS addressed Committee and informed that he had investigated delivery options and the time constraints. It now appeared that pre-loading and wick drains is the optimum solution.</p> <p>CS noted that wicks will get rid of primary settlement early in the program.</p> <p>AR queried whether this would result in post construction maintenance costs.</p> <p>CS responded and explained that it is a matter of striking a balance - given the geotechnical constraints.</p> <p>AS queried the need to excavate Section A of the canal thereby eliminating the potential to utilise Crescent Avenue as an access. This would avoid the need for construction of a sidetrack at Sickle Avenue.</p>	



	<p>Significant funds would be saved in the construction of Sickle Avenue Bridge and this would also allow for a more efficient construction program.</p> <p>MA noted that Council could force a temporary road closure in Sickle Avenue to facilitate construction of bridge.</p> <p>AS undertook to advise JF to get comments from HICA in relation to this proposal.</p> <p>Resolve: CS to proceed with going to tender for construction items associated with Sickle Avenue bridge and keep items separate (in case it is resolved that AS' proposal to maintain connectivity via Crescent Avenue as a temporary access is more advantageous and results in benefits to the construction program of the bridge prior to excavation of Section A).</p>	<p><b>All Committee members to give consideration to this issue for discussion at next weeks meeting</b></p> <p>AS to cause JF to get comments from HICA in relation to this proposal</p>
	<p><b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b></p>	
	<p><u>Pedestrian Bridge</u></p> <p>GY addressed Committee and advised that he has been informed that preliminary investigations by Parsons Brinckerhoff had revealed the potential for a vehicular bridge at Crescent Avenue to accommodate future traffic demand.</p> <p>GY suggested that this was a likely outcome of the investigations. GY queried the expectation of the developers with respect to the height of the bridge, particularly given the arrangements between Council and Aurora and the fact that it would potentially increase the impact on adjacent landowners.</p> <p>MA noted that Aurora had relied upon exchange of letters with Council which result in the raising of bridge heights to 6 metres aht. AR suggested that Council officers confirm height of bridge at Runaway Islands.</p> <p>AS noted that when speaking with EP viz upgrade of Hope Island Road, EP advised that DMR did not intend to upgrade Jabiru Bridge.</p> <p>PH queried the need for a consultation period with the public. AR advised that he had already discussed the planned pedestrian bridge with residents and that a vehicular bridge would be additional consultation.</p> <p>NP noted that more detailed planning was required. GY advised that given the implications of this matter, it was important that this matter was appropriately noted in the minutes.</p> <p>MA acknowledged GY's comments and expressed that Aurora's expectation would be that the height of any structure crossing Crescent Avenue would be at 6 meters aht given contractual undertakings it has entered into in reliance upon previous arrangements with Council.</p>	

Acceleration of Time Frame for Bridge

SH noted that the accelerated time frames will cause increase in cost which will be distributed when final cost to hand.

AS responded and noted that he will formally respond to Council (SH) viz payment of cost differential once final costings were to hand.

Sickle Avenue Roundabout

MA queried the positioning of the Sickle Avenue roundabout and requested if Council had considered making the turn in Sickle Avenue less aggressive.

NP responded and noted that Council had some flexibility to repositioning of roundabout and/or accommodating a larger radius which results in less aggressive bend provided roundabout remains within road reserve. However, this would require co-ordination with construction of the Sickle Avenue bridge.

Meeting closed.

SH to provide additional costs for preloading, wick drains, etc. used to accelerate the bridge delivery

# Minutes

## HOPE ISLAND Masterplanning Committee

DATE	4 August 2003
TIME START:	2:30pm
TIME FINISHED:	3:45pm
MEETING NO.	7
LOCATION:	Room 5, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
PRESENT:	Councillor Alan Rickard ("AR") Eddie Peters - ("EP") Greg Young - Gold Coast City Council Director - EDMP ("GY") Paul Herd - Gold Coast City Council- EDMP ("PH") Steve Harrison - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("SH") Rob Alcock - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("RA") Richard Pascoe - Gold Coast City Council - Parks ("RP") Noel Pearson - Gold Coast City Council - Transport ("NP") Chris Stephens Gold Coast City Council - Engineering Services ("CS") Michael Adamson - Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("MA") Ross Heatley - Group Town Planner for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("RH") Adam Slidjerink - Project Director for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("AS")
APOLOGIES	Peta Kaye-Croft - Member for Broadwater ("PKC") Craig Gore - Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("CG") Mark Reynolds - Engineering Services ("MR") Chris Netherway - ("CN") John Fish - ("JF") Boyd Sargeant - ("BS") Edwin Yu - ("EY") Gerard Cassar - ("GC")

### AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	PREVIOUS MINUTES	
	AR acknowledged minutes circulated from meeting held 28 July 2003.	
	Resolved: Committee accepted minutes circulated as accurate.	

2.	<p><b>UPGRADING OF HOPE ISLAND ROAD</b></p> <p>This item was added to the agenda for today's meeting.</p> <p>EP notified the Committee of proposal for the establishment of a sub-committee (administered by DMR) to progress the future upgrading of Hope Island Road from M1 motorway to immediately west of Paradise Point Bridge (ie Jabiru Bridge).</p> <p>EP proposed that the sub-committee would report to the Hope Island Master Planning Committee viz upgrading of Hope Island Road. EP circulated a draft terms of reference for comment by Committee members.</p> <p>NP agreed to participate in the sub-committee as a representative of Council.</p> <p>AS noted that DMR needed approval before it can gain access to a flood model prepared by Lawson Treloar Engineers. SH responded that the relevant Council officers would be notified to provide information to ensure that the sub-committee could make informed decisions.</p> <p>Resolve: Establishment of sub-committee endorsed by the Hope Island Master Planning Committee. EP to contact MA in next week to set up first meeting of sub-committee.</p>	<p>EP to contact MA in next week to set up first meeting of sub-committee</p>
3.	<p><b>SPECIAL RATE FOR RECOUPING CANAL RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS</b></p> <p>RA addressed committee and explained that this matter related to how Council recoups the cost of construction for Section A of the canal. The current scenario is vastly different from the scenario which existed at the time this issue was formalized, given that initially there were a large number of HICA members - there are now only approximately 8 land owners.</p> <p>Resolve: RA is to investigate this matter and report back to the Committee as to the timing of payment of the special rate (ie upon developer seeking sealing of sub-divisional plans or alternatively, at some later point ie settlement of sale of subdivided lots.</p>	
4.	<p><b>SALE OF SAND AGREEMENT</b></p> <p>GY advised that HICA were not prepared to sign a sale of sand agreement to acquire sand material excavated from Section A of the canal at a rate of \$6 per sq metre. Despite extensive communication between Council and HICA regarding this issue, the agreement was not formalised. GY advised that currently there is not a strong market for fill material.</p> <p>GY noted that Council is now looking to sell sand material.</p> <p>GY highlighted that there is a potential short fall in funds if material is not sold and this would have to be borne by landowners. In particular, GY raised the potential for inequity between Section B and Section C / D landowners. In the circumstances, GY wanted to ensure an appropriate apportionment of costs.</p>	

	<p>MA queried whether AS required any fill material for Aurora lands. AS responded by noting it was a timing issue, but he would review his program and respond if there was any need for Aurora to require fill material.</p>	<p>AS to advise committee if Aurora could utilise any of the excess sand.</p>
5.	<p><b>AURORA'S COMMITMENT TO HOPE ISLAND</b></p> <p>MA addressed the Committee to clarify Aurora intentions and reaffirm its commitment to projects in the Hope Island area.</p> <p>MA announced that Aurora had entered into contractual negotiations with a third party who sought to purchase its land holdings on the western side of the Hope Island Canal. Under its contractual arrangements, Aurora will be required to deliver its land holdings filled and compacted, together with all infrastructure (including bridges at 6 metres aht, midway roundabout on Hope Island Road, and completion of Hope Island Canal to Santa Barbara Road end).</p> <p>GY stated that Council would be seeking contractual commitments to each of the projects (i.e. cost differential for the raising of the Sickie Avenue Bridge from 4.05 metres aht to 6 metres aht).</p> <p>AR acknowledged commitment and confirmed that he had been made aware that the sale by Aurora would remain conditional upon the completion of the canal and the raising of the bridges.</p>	<p>MA / GCCC to prepare contracts (where &amp; when appropriate) for the payment and construction of Hope Island projects</p>
6.	<p><b>ROAD CLOSURE OF PENDRAAT PARADE</b></p> <p>MA informed committee that Aurora had lodged an application for the closure of Pendraat Parade and that Council would consider a report on this matter on 8 August 2003. After Council approval, a submission would be made to DNR to enable the road closure application to proceed and be finalised.</p>	
7.	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE PARK - RELOCATION OF TENNIS COURTS (UPDATE)</b></p> <p>RH presented a concept plan prepared by Knobel Consulting which positioned tennis courts in accordance with the previous discussions of the Committee (i.e. 10 metres from the Sickie avenue road reserve).</p> <p>The plan illustrated bikeway on southern side of Sickie Avenue road reserve - which RH maintained was preferable to northern side as shown in town plan.</p> <p>RH indicated that lighting for the tennis courts can sometimes be a source of controversy.</p> <p>RP responded by stating that it will be necessary for lighting to meet Australian Standards (this requires appropriate shrouding and projection of lighting). RP reaffirmed that the positioning of the tennis courts shown on the concept plan is acceptable to the Parks Section.</p>	

	<p>AR noted that further landscaping could be achieved in front of tennis courts (similar to screening around pump station in Sickle Avenue).</p> <p>AS highlighted that the positioning of the courts on the concept plan will result in a 14 metre road dedication from the landowner of Lot 218 and a 6 metre requirement on Council's park.</p> <p>AR questioned the need for a fence along the canal front.</p> <p>RP noted that Council is to be aware of risk management issues in terms of the park fronting the canal.</p> <p>SH advised that only the clubhouse / amenity buildings will be raised to a Q100 level in the park, with the remainder of the park at a Q5 level for use as additional flood storage.</p> <p>Resolved - The Committee approved the proposed position of tennis courts as shown on the concept plan (everything else illustrated on plan indicative only).</p> <p>It was further resolved that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CS is to provide pad size to AS</li> <li>• AS to contact BradLees for survey data (SH has previously given direction to BradLees to provide all survey data to Aurora upon request).</li> <li>• Tennis courts to be located to avoid the sewer pump station.</li> <li>• Detailed plan to be forwarded to Engineering Services as soon as possible.</li> </ul> <p>No further Committee resolutions will be required.</p>	<p>CS to provide pad size to AS</p> <p>AS to contact BradLees for survey data and incorporate into detailed plan layout as soon as possible</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE BRIDGE</b></p> <p>AS addressed Committee and informed that he had investigated delivery options and the time constraints. It now appeared that pre-loading and wick drains is the optimum solution.</p> <p>CS noted that wicks will get rid of primary settlement early in the program.</p> <p>AR queried whether this would result in post construction maintenance costs.</p> <p>CS responded and explained that it is a matter of striking a balance - given the geotechnical constraints.</p> <p>AS queried the need to excavate Section A of the canal thereby eliminating the potential to utilise Crescent Avenue as an access. This would avoid the need for construction of a sidetrack at Sickle Avenue.</p>	

	<p>Significant funds would be saved in the construction of Sickle Avenue Bridge and this would also allow for a more efficient construction program.</p> <p>MA noted that Council could force a temporary road closure in Sickle Avenue to facilitate construction of bridge.</p> <p>AS undertook to advise JF to get comments from HICA in relation to this proposal.</p> <p>Resolve: CS to proceed with going to tender for construction items associated with Sickle Avenue bridge and keep items separate (in case it is resolved that AS' proposal to maintain connectivity via Crescent Avenue as a temporary access is more advantageous and results in benefits to the construction program of the bridge prior to excavation of Section A).</p>	<p>All Committee members to give consideration to this issue for discussion at next weeks meeting</p> <p>AS to cause JF to get comments from HICA in relation to this proposal</p>
	<p><b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b></p>	
	<p><u>Pedestrian Bridge</u></p> <p>GY addressed Committee and advised that he has been informed that preliminary investigations by Parsons Brinckerhoff had revealed the potential for a vehicular bridge at Crescent Avenue to accommodate future traffic demand.</p> <p>GY suggested that this was a likely outcome of the investigations. GY queried the expectation of the developers with respect to the height of the bridge, particularly given the arrangements between Council and Aurora and the fact that it would potentially increase the impact on adjacent landowners.</p> <p>MA noted that Aurora had relied upon exchange of letters with Council which result in the raising of bridge heights to 6 metres aht. AR suggested that Council officers confirm height of bridge at Runaway Islands.</p> <p>AS noted that when speaking with EP viz upgrade of Hope Island Road, EP advised that DMR did not intend to upgrade Jabiru Bridge.</p> <p>PH queried the need for a consultation period with the public. AR advised that he had already discussed the planned pedestrian bridge with residents and that a vehicular bridge would be additional consultation.</p> <p>NP noted that more detailed planning was required. GY advised that given the implications of this matter, it was important that this matter was appropriately noted in the minutes.</p> <p>MA acknowledged GY's comments and expressed that Aurora's expectation would be that the height of any structure crossing Crescent Avenue would be at 6 meters aht given contractual undertakings it has entered into in reliance upon previous arrangements with Council.</p>	

<p><u>Acceleration of Time Frame for Bridge</u> SH noted that the accelerated time frames will cause increase in cost which will be distributed when final cost to hand.</p> <p>AS responded and noted that he will formally respond to Council (SH) viz payment of cost differential once final costings were to hand.</p> <p><u>Sickle Avenue Roundabout</u> MA queried the positioning of the Sickle Avenue roundabout and requested if Council had considered making the turn in Sickle Avenue less aggressive.</p> <p>NP responded and noted that Council had some flexibility to repositioning of roundabout and/or accommodating a larger radius which results in less aggressive bend provided roundabout remains within road reserve. However, this would require co-ordination with construction of the Sickle Avenue bridge.</p> <p>Meeting closed.</p>	<p>SH to provide additional costs for preloading, wick drains, etc. used to accelerate the bridge delivery</p>
--	--



# Minutes

## HOPE ISLAND Masterplanning Committee

DATE	11 August 2003
TIME START:	2:30pm
TIME FINISHED:	4:30pm
MEETING NO	9
LOCATION:	Room 5, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
PRESENT:	Councillor Alan Rickard ("AR") Greg Young - Gold Coast City Council Director - EDMP ("GY") Paul Herd - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("PH") Steve Harrison - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("SH") Rob Alcock - Gold Coast City Council - EDMP ("RA") Richard Pascoe - Gold Coast City Council - Parks ("RP") Noel Pearson - Gold Coast City Council - Transport ("NP") Chris Stephens - Gold Coast City Council - Engineering Services ("CS") Michael Adamson - Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("MA") Ross Heatley - Group Town Planner for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("RH") Adam Slidjerink - Project Director for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("AS") John Fish - Fish Developments P/L ("JF") Boyd Sergeant - Planit Consulting ("BS") Eddie Peters - DMR ("EP")
APOLOGIES	Peta-Kaye Croft - Honorable Member for Broadwater ("PK") Edwin Yu ("EY") Mark Reynolds - Engineering Services ("MR") Gerard Cassar ("GC") Chris Netherway - ("CN")

### AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	<b>PREVIOUS MINUTES</b> AR acknowledged minutes circulated from meeting held 4 August 2003 SH noted that minutes would be amended to reflect apology of PK  Resolved: Committee otherwise accepted minutes circulated as accurate.	
2.	<b>BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES</b> GY suggested this and future meetings include "Business Arising" as an agenda item.  Resolve: this was agreed by the Committee	Business Arising to be added to Agenda

	<p>NP noted that Parsons Brinckerhoff have now compiled all the traffic information required, and will make an assessment. It can then be determined whether the footbridge in Crescent Avenue should become a road bridge.</p> <p>CS queried whether Sickle Avenue should be four lanes.</p> <p>JF expressed doubt in this proposition, as the major access road to the area is only 2 lanes (i.e. Broadwater Avenue).</p> <p>GY reported in relation to following matters:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigation has been made in relation to legislative impediments viz special rate. This matter will be included as an agenda item next week. It may be proposed that full payment imposed up front (first year after completion of canal and associated infrastructure) - then commercial arrangements will be made over certian year period with party/s responsible;</li> <li>• BS disclosed that Parsons Brinckerhoff have provided preliminary advice to the effect that either Sickle Avenue may require four lanes or construction of a vehicle bridge may be required at Crescent Avenue.</li> </ul> <p>BS undertook to provide a detailed report at next Monday's meeting in relation to this matter.</p> <p>BS also reported that there is a concern that the proposed fill levels may not be adequate to dispose of stormwater. Again BS to report at next Monday's meeting.</p> <p>AR noted that the recommendations of Parsons Brinckerhoff will need to be closely scrutinised by the Committee. AR also emphasised that the information should be made available as early as practicably possible for the benefit of the Committee.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE CULVERTS (PROGRAM)</b></p>	
	<p>SH raised that there were two options available with respect to construction of culverts in Sickle Avenue:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. They can be located at bed of canal;</li> <li>2. They can be located at a higher level (i.e. just below water level).</li> </ol> <p>If option 1 is pursued this would be cost prohibitive given that culverts are 70-80 metres long. Culverts may also need piles under the slab. A slab would cost in the order of \$800,000.00.</p> <p>SH noted that preliminary investigations have revealed that the best alternative would be to construct a low level bridge. Council presently are undertaking a cost comparison exercise. Further figures will be provided shortly. A preliminary estimation for construction of low level bridge would be in the order of \$1.8 million.</p> <p>JF noted that a low level bridge would be best for everybody.</p> <p>PH noted that any increased cost would result in part of special rate.</p> <p>AR summarised that the comments of SH were noted and the information is now on the table.</p>	

4.	<b>SICKLE AVENUE PARK - RELOCATION OF TENNIS COURTS (UPDATE)</b>	
	<p>SH noted that the conceptual plan distributed last week had been refined by Aurora during the course of last week.</p> <p>RH noted that the refined plan now takes account of sewer pump station. The new plan locates tennis court 15 metres from Sickle Avenue alignment (previously 10 metres).</p> <p>JF noted that the proprietor of Lot 218 was approached on the basis of a 13 metre/7 metre split. The Committee agreed to this arrangement.</p> <p>RP noted that Parks had no objection with the revised location of tennis courts and the new plan presented.</p> <p>AR queried whether car parking could be extended towards canal. After general discussion it was agreed that this could be achieved.</p> <p>Resolved: Revised plan accepted (resulting in a 13 metre/7 metre split).</p> <p>BS queried the timing for construction of car parking.</p> <p>JF noted that a development application could now be submitted in respect of the subdivision of Lot 218 - provided this can be progressed expeditiously, then service road can be constructed.</p> <p>JF advised that fill can be placed in a couple of weeks.</p>	Eng. Services to incorporate revised plan in advertising for tennis court construction
5.	<b>OPEN SPACE - INTENT FOR THE HOPE ISLAND AREA</b>	
	<p>MA addressed the Committee and reported that RH (as Aurora's group town planner) received last week a draft report regarding the development application submitted for Sickle Avenue land holdings. Consequently, MA requested clarification regarding Council's intent for Open Space in the Hope Island area.</p> <p>RH addressed the committee and stated that the DCP contemplates that a monetary contribution is preferred for the Hope Island area, as opposed to dedication of public open space.</p> <p>AR expressed that the new LAP (yet to be adopted) saw that open space would be required where possible.</p> <p>BS responded and noted that it was not purpose of Committee to assess individual DA's. BS confirmed that he will undertake review of conditions in context of preliminary outcome of structure planning process.</p> <p>BS reported that he had received plans prepared by Aurora which were certainly helpful. However, further assessments would be required. In view of the comments made by MA/RH, BS undertook to review the matter with relevant council officers and report to Committee next Monday.</p> <p>AR noted that Council should investigate what it is legally entitled to condition.</p>	

	<p>AR reminded Committee that information was to be presented as soon as practically possible to enable Committee to scrutinise.</p> <p>Resolved: BS to report in relation to open space at next Monday's meeting.</p>	<p>BS to provide a report to the next meeting of the committee</p>
6.	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE BRIDGE (CONSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY, ACCESS AND WICKS)</b></p> <p>AS revisited proposal discussed at last weeks meeting in relation to maintaining Crescent Avenue for access purposes until after completion of construction of Sickle Avenue bridge.</p> <p>CS noted that he was progressing with program for construction of Sickle Avenue bridge. Advertising was being placed this weekend.</p> <p>SH noted that he had received preliminary advice from Neumanns that to maintain access via Crescent Avenue the cost of demobilisation / remobilisation to delay excavation / construction of Section A would be in the order of \$250 - \$300,000. This would be assessed against the benefits of potential savings and construction efficiencies to the Sickle Avenue bridge.</p> <p>SH suggested this issue can be considered further during the course of this week. SH undertook to involve AS in discussions with Council officers in relation to this issue.</p> <p>AR suggested that the Committee could be informed with respect to the solution of this matter.</p> <p>PH noted that he was awaiting further advices from MR in relation to this issue.</p> <p>AS noted that the demobilisation / remobilisation estimate provided by Neumann's seemed a bit high.</p> <p>RA cautioned that there may be other items in cost estimation.</p> <p>SH agreed that further particulars of such costs needed to be investigated and queried.</p> <p>Resolved: SH would convene a meeting between Council officers, Consultants BradLees and AS to discuss this issue.</p>	<p>SH to convene meeting asap to discuss cost and timing implications of maintaining access via Crescent Ave versus savings to Sickle Avenue bridge</p>
7.	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE ROUNDABOUT</b></p> <p>Committee informed that a fresh plan had been prepared by NP which repositioned roundabout (saving public open space) given the proposed access to Sickle Avenue site identified in development application (being first development application lodged by Sickle Avenue Pty Ltd).</p> <p>Resolved: Road level to be Q100 minus 300mm. Matter to be considered further (where appropriate) as development application progresses.</p> <p>CS noted that road alignment stops at a certain point and that no detailed drawings had been produced. Presumably, road will then taper down to existing road level.</p>	<p>Noel Pearson to liaise with Aurora and update the Committee where appropriate</p>

8.	<b>ROAD CLOSURE OF PENDRAAT PARADE</b>	
	<p>AR acknowledged that item was on agenda of Council meeting held last Friday.</p> <p>MA noted that co-ordination would now be required between Council officers and DNR to ensure the road closure process could now be completed.</p> <p>MA also noted that specific arrangements were required with respect to effluent line which was constructed under road reserve.</p> <p>Resolved: AS to brief SH in relation to advices received from Knobel Consulting in relation to effluent line.</p>	AS to brief SH on issues relating to sewer line.
9.	<b>SECTION A - SURPLUS SAND ISSUES</b>	
	<p>JF acknowledged that this issue had already been discussed with Council officers regarding the uses for sand. Issue centers around Council having excess sand material - no market now exists therefore Council will not be able to offset its construction costs. All benefiting landowners will bear the additional cost impacts via the Special Rate.</p>	
10.	<b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b>	
	<p><b><u>SERVICE ROAD</u></b></p> <p>EP reported that DMR was concerned with motorists attempting to egress the Hope Island tavern at Broadwater Avenue and doing u-turns. DMR reluctant to give right turn access out of tavern - therefore seeking acceleration of service road construction.</p> <p>JF advised that he had a meeting with EY last Saturday.</p> <p>JF also acknowledged he was aware of CG's meetings with EP in relation to service road generally.</p> <p>EP advised the Committee that he had now confirmed that relevant section of land owned by DNR (highlighted on plan) was a road reserve. This results in two possibilities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. JF (or nominee) could seek to close road and obtain title through DNR. This would require public tender or offer to someone else. May be difficulties - and EP noted general risk exposure to JF;</li> <li>2. Alternatively, Gold Coast City Council could agree to have carpark constructed on road (with agreement from DMR and DNR).</li> </ol> <p>EP then noted that if the relevant section of land is an impediment to service road progressing, if Council were to agree, DMR would agree to construction of car park. Then we only have to get DNR to agree. The matter would then be in the hands of the Gold Coast City Council.</p> <p>JF expressed concern that this would not resolve security of tenure as it was important that he obtains freehold title.</p> <p>EP suggested JF liaise with DNR regarding their attitude on road closures. EP expressed concern that service road may be 12 months away.</p>	

<p>JF gave firm undertaking - if this issue can be resolved - he can move immediately to construct service road from roundabout at Pendraat Parade through to proposed service station.</p> <p>BS noted that Parsons Brinckerhoff were undertaking preliminary designs for a service road from proposed service station through to the roundabout at the arts &amp; craft village and that this would provide access to the Hope Island tavern.</p> <p>JF reiterated that he would commence construction immediately approval was in place.</p> <p>Meeting closed.</p>	<p>BS to advise when preliminary design of service road is complete. Matter to be raised at future Committee meeting.</p>
--	---

**MINUTES OF HOPE ISLAND  
MASTER PLANNING COMMITTEE**

<b>DATE</b>	18 August 2003
<b>TIME START:</b>	2:30pm
<b>TIME FINISHED:</b>	4:30pm
<b>MEETING NUMBER:</b>	9
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Room 5, Level 1, Gold Coast City Council Chambers, Nerang
<b>PRESENT:</b>	<p>Councillor Alan Rickard ("AR")</p> <p>Paul Herd – Gold Coast City Council – EDMP ("PH")</p> <p>Steve Harrison – Gold Coast City Council – EDMP ("SH")</p> <p>Rob Alcock – Gold Coast City Council – EDMP ("RA")</p> <p>Noel Pearson – Gold Coast City Council – Transport ("NP")</p> <p>Chris Stevens – Gold Coast City Council – Engineering Services ("CS")</p> <p>Michael Adamson – Legal Counsel for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("MA")</p> <p>Ross Heatley – Group Town Planner for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("RH")</p> <p>Adam Slidjerink – Project Director for Aurora Developments Pty Ltd ("AS")</p> <p>Ian Janetzski - Fish Developments Pty Ltd ("IJ")</p> <p>Matt Heldon - Fish Developments Pty Ltd ("MH")</p> <p>Boyd Sergeant – Planit Consulting ("BS")</p> <p>Edwin Yu ("EY")</p>
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	<p>Peta-Kaye Croft – Honorable Member for Broadwater ("PK")</p> <p>Eddie Peters – District Director of Main Roads ("EP")</p> <p>Greg Young – Gold Coast City Council Director – EDMP ("GY")</p> <p>Richard Pascoe – Parks ("RP")</p> <p>Mark Reynolds – Engineering Services ("MR")</p> <p>Gerard Cassar ("GC")</p> <p>Chris Netherway – Gold Coast City Council ("CN")</p> <p>John Fish – Fish Developments Pty Ltd ("JF")</p>

**AGENDA ITEMS:**

ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	<b>PREVIOUS MINUTES</b>	
	AR acknowledged minutes circulated from meeting held 11 August 2003	
	Resolved: Committee accepted minutes circulated as accurate.	
2.	<b>BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES</b>	

AR queried outcome of meeting between BS and Parsons Brinckerhoff ("PB") on Thursday last 14 August, 2003.

BS advised the Committee:

- PB have considered maps presented by Aurora and fed in Committee comments and information through process;
- BS expects another round of comments from Council officers;
- information will be presented to this Committee for scrutiny;
- recommendations will be presented to full Council for decision;

BS provided **preliminary** report in relation to the following matters:

(i) Densities

- Overall density maximum is 40 dwellings per hectare
- RD3 blanket across area (opportunity for RDI - RD5)

(ii) Transport

- Number of scenarios modeled with 1 & 2 bridges
- PB to report timing for road infrastructure upgrade.
- New vehicle bridge at Crescent Avenue means two lanes thru Sickle Ave OK.
- Service road northern side of Broadwater Ave - two lanes.
- Oyster Cove roundabout more sustainable if Crescent Avenue bridge built.
- Sanctuary Cove stats validated and modeled.
- Sickle Avenue slip road - alignment to the south may impact park and sewer pump facility.
- Access for V double at roundabouts required.
- Possible transit centre has no effect on traffic projections to the north.
- Vehicle Bridge in Crescent Avenue has advantages viz:
  - will relieve Oyster Cove roundabout;
  - will allow Sickle Avenue bridge planning and works to continue expeditiously;
  - enables network circulation.

Sanctuary Cove to contribute to infrastructure? – Council to investigate.

NP to review and report PB findings to Committee

AR requested information be relayed to DMR sub-committee.

BS to report to DMR sub-cm'ttee

(iii) Building heights

- Maximum 7 storey either side of Sickle Avenue;
- Maximum 7 storey around transit centre area;
- Maximum 7 storey east of Sheehan;
- Maximum 10 storey on land holdings owned by



	<p>Fish/Scheider/Neumans (Crescent Avenue/Sickle Avenue alignments may require change to accommodate such height).</p> <p><u>(iv) Drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fill plan grades at 1:200;</li> <li>• Requirement for greater fill levels to most of study area.</li> </ul> <p><u>(v) Open Space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All areas identified for increase;</li> <li>• Requirement for contribution of boardwalk in areas;</li> <li>• Bi-Lo identified as end destination for landholdings on Hope Island;</li> <li>• 1-2 hectare park identified in central island (intention to connect boardwalks with park);</li> <li>• To south of island, service road accommodates bikeway/pedestrian way (therefore no construction of boardwalk required) - no boardwalk remains desirable;</li> </ul> <p>BS advised that the Structure Plan should be complete within 4-5 weeks.</p> <p>AS queried whether Aurora lands west of canal had been considered by PB - BS advised No.</p> <p>RH commented on boardwalk along water bound periphery of Sickle Avenue land holdings to provide connection to Bi-Lo shopping centre and stated that the current planning scheme does not seek land dedication from subject lands - rather financial contribution.</p> <p>BS responded: information relayed was draft only and stated Council would be concerned to ensure connectivity which may not be achieved by a road network.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>SICKLE AVENUE BRIDGE DISCUSSION</b></p>	
	<p>CS advised Council have gone to tender on bridge.</p> <p>Discussion ensued on access during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AS raised issue of Neumann's remobilisation fee.</li> <li>• AR/AS - if small dredge in Section A, the cost may come down.</li> <li>• AR sought clarification of sequencing of construction of bridge and Committee confirmed:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Side access road constructed through park;</li> <li>2. Road broken up;</li> <li>3. Bridge constructed.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• AS -can Sickle Avenue be the subject of a temporary road closure (given that temporary access would be afforded through Crescent Avenue) to allow AS to commence wicking?</li> <li>• CS - wicking and pre-loading not on critical path.</li> <li>• PH noted that the four lane issue is in critical path.</li> <li>• RA queried opportunity to widen bridge or re-align for possible future capacity (ie 4 lanes)</li> <li>• CS noted if Sickle Avenue to be duplicated - a different design approach for bridge is required.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AR - would prefer not to see link broken at Crescent Avenue until access through west Sickle bridge in place (and ideally Sickle Avenue bridge constructed).</li> <li>RA - Council is obligated to start Section A at completion of Section B.</li> <li>RA queried proceeding with program to build pedestrian bridge if vehicle bridge is resolved to be constructed some time in the future.</li> <li>BS confirmed bridge in Crescent Avenue is preferred option (will require co-ordination of impacts with DMR)</li> <li>AR - the dates behind PB's conclusions need to be considered.</li> <li>AR suggested a flow chart be prepared with respect to decision-making process and time frames.</li> </ul>	SH to prepare flow chart with decision making process and time frames.
4.	<b>PAYMENT OF SPECIAL RATE</b>	
	PH presented draft report in relation to special rate issues	Committee to review & comment.
5.	<b>OPEN SPACE INTENT</b>	
	<p>BS identified areas of open space desired:</p> <p>(a) Urban park adjacent to Oyster Cove;</p> <p>(b) Recreational park (1-2 hectares) in central island;</p> <p>(c) Park in vicinity of Section A</p> <p>Open space will be delivered through development process (with recompense to owners which grant).</p> <p>RH undertook to put together a document to articulate mechanisms to achieve open space outcomes - this would be prepared from a private sector perspective.</p>	RH to deliver report next meeting
6.	<b>REPORT ON TRAFFIC GENERATION FROM FUTURE DEVELOPMENT (PARSONS PRINCKERHOFF) -</b>	
	This agenda item has been dealt with previously today.	
7.	<b>PLAN FOR BOYKAMBIL PARKS/SECTION A PARK AREA</b>	
	<p>AR advised Committee that he had a responsibility to residents of Boykambil to keep them informed in relation to this issue.</p> <p>AR queried the existence of a plan previously prepared by Emanouel -</p> <p>AR: need to develop a response to Boykambil residents - letter will be copied to this Committee.</p>	<p>SH to locate plan.</p> <p>AR/SH</p>
8.	<b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b>	
	<p><u>Sickle Avenue Bridge</u></p> <p>AS reiterated that if Section A excavated and opened to Coomera River prior to completion of Sickle Avenue bridge and dredging under that section, he has concern that EPA or DPI may wish to exercise jurisdiction which may impede ability to dredge under bridge at relevant time.</p> <p>SH tendered letter of advice received from Council's Solicitors - this advice provides that Section 86 of the Harbours Act does not apply given the approval for the canal scheme (and associated works) under the City of Brisbane (Flood Mitigation Works Approval) Act 1952.</p>	Record in minutes Council undertakes to accept Its

<p>AR queried sequence of construction of canal and Committee confirmed as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Side access road constructed through park;</li><li>• Sickle Avenue bridge constructed;</li><li>• Section A commences;</li><li>• When water quality OK - contractor will break through to Coomera River.</li></ul> <p>From a timing perspective, AR confirmed his preference for Sickle Avenue bridge to be completed before Crescent Avenue and/or Poole Street severed.</p> <p>RA timing cannot be determined at this stage.</p> <p>AR - the preservation of the Crescent Avenue and/or Poole Street access would be preferred given that only access to area is temporary side track.</p> <p><u>Sickle Avenue Southern Arm Crossing</u> Committee informed that Council officers will be recommending a bridge crossing (not Culverts).</p> <p>Meeting closed.</p>	<p>Solicitors advice in this matter.</p>
---	--

#15246872