

Returned

Books/tapes on loan

✓ LOAN - Peter

To Nick Jeradovitch - Planner ✓ 2/8/93

✓ mo. Development - Feasibility Study by Land C. 1984

✓ L&C - mo Report - 1985

✓ Low Cost Country Home Building Handbook 1981

✓ Hamlet Development - near - PEC. 1980

✓ mo - Wyatt Report 1986

~~Alternative Lifestyles~~ } 1988

~~Group Notes 1-5~~

~~6-10~~

~~Course Reader & 11 tapes~~

✓ Retreat or Advance - Taylor 1981

✓ Communes in Rural Australia. 1986

✓ Aspects of Land Use & Rhythmic Living - Porcup 1981

✓ Conflict of Value, Attitudes & Objectives. Porcup. 1981

✓ Low Cost Rural Resettlement - S. Williams 1983

~~Rural Land Planning Communities: an Act Model. 1985~~

~~Summarised DRAFT~~

✓ Bodhi Photo album.

+ Senior Clough

Reader to 'Alt Lifestyles' Course

T Eddie Ruidis

RATF sub to COT
etc.

Notes on Meeting with Nick 2.8.93 Peter, Eddie, Simon

Lough Knight - Dor Grafton.

Why & what happens next?

Nick to circulate his draft paragraphs of options with case ± each.

- (?) What prompted request to Dor Grafton? - Not asked, as the answer is in their letter to Dor in, they had had submissions from the Discretion paper to this effect

Implication Nick could/would not make his own judgement/reading of the policy or he would not get opinion from Council's solicitor. I was the opinion on the DPA while it is inclusive & does not address the aims specifically, nevertheless, does not see a problem here.

- (?) Is his concern/preference to have an RFP+DCP policy motivated by Aim C(1)(i)? No, also 25% of land is unnecessarily restrictive
+ b) the density formula.

He wants in general a "performance based" approach - eg DCP where open enough for each case to be considered on its merits. This is a two edged sword!

- (?) How have you determined "rural pop loss" and how have the ones near examination been determined?

A: For the whole rural area. Based on CD's and changes in these stats over time.

This seemed to me very woolly & I suspect maybe gilded at best.)

Showed him Spain's opinion (offered for him to keep - in exchange for Council's legal opinion. He did exchange, Spain read & handed back saying he knew (or knew off) Spain & said that his opinion would have to be seen as possibly biased in view of his interest in mo. (No attempt to disguise on its merits).

Advised him we proposed contacting the Legal Br in Syd. to get a neutral opinion or b) if they agreed to have them amend St PR-18.

He said in the light of this he requested us to write in stating this and he would consider not reporting to Council on 17 Aug or was it? a) he would report to Council on 17 Aug not to do anything until we had reply.

Nick is planning to confirm the number of Councillors going on inspection at meeting of 3 Aug. (It appeared he was not aware of Dist count of 5-6. He says he will keep changing up dates until Council agrees to all/most come or confront them bias).

NB Aim (iii) affects the state - not just dis. & must be addressed at a state level.

Rural Res. provisions may have a 200m buffer to agricultural land, quarries, dairies etc.

the proposal of a 200m buffer between MO & neighbour (taking into account other constraints) would mean no MO in his. it would cover the whole rural area.

Nick sees the Rural Res. as a model for MO.

I alerted him to come in terminology re MO & CT and MO. He noted.

He said some Councils had adopted different MO density formulas.

His range of options is still as in Dis. Paper

[My Comment on 'performance' principle. Compare how S.94 charges have gone up but frozen in DO & Retirement Villages etc. (of one time freeze on MO & where it has gone since this I lifted.)

I drew attention to the importance of always saying that CT not available to MO & not implying this was possible as he had done at Workshops via relinquishing MO status & acquiring Rural Res + CT.

URGENT.

Van Comto
 Confirm to Nick his statement at the Workshop
 that he would circulate his prewrite with
 I before making final recommendation &
 report to Council.

His response is as seemed contrary to this -
 check. What does he have in mind?
 Does he still plan to put options to
 Council on 17th? (Get J to check
 what he is proposing to put to meeting
 of 17th)

He says he wants/proposes to put the
 "options" to Council - not his prewrite.

I consider this is a duplication as these
 appear in the D. Paper & have been already
 noted by Council.

There is a risk that Council may make a
 snap decision or decision as to what
 path he is to follow!

He is further saying that when he put the
 draft D Paper to Council he did not have
 the DOP opinion (Check date)

He mentioned Konaally would be jumping staff
 in 2 weeks & David's view was in support
 of the ~~el~~(m) regding. I expressed unlikely
 & he went (allegedly) to check with
 someone & on coming back said - No -
 David had not been contacted re
 this.

He is aware David was involved - SEP 15

Consider using RATT to broaden the
clout. ie get other areas to also write
re this.

NB On Nick's copy of the Aims, the
"and" and only this "and" is highlighted
in blue.

Why did he not disclose the ~~DOI~~ opinion
at the Workshop?

Write Nick (Council) to get ^{some} legal opinion.

Mike wants to have a 'MO-DEP' 'presumptive'
but with an 'out' clause 'erasing' (but
cl. for Council to do anything on merit
or bias. (At this level at this time,
this sounds like open slather for
rapid unplanned unlimited random
development.

He keeps using the term "presumptive"
but with the 'waggle' clause in effect
becomes 'performance' based.