

MALENY COMMUNITY PRECINCT ADVISORY GROUP MEEETING

Date	Tuesday 24 May, 2011
Time & Duration	10am to 12.15pm
Location	RSL Bunya Street Maleny
Meeting Attendees	Graham Hart (Chair), Max Whitten, Gail Denver, Carolyn Williams, Glen Donoghoe (proxy for Barung), Peter Stevens, Paul Gilmour-Walsh (proxy for Green Hills), John Brown (proxy for Sport and Recreation), Joyce Newton Council attendees Cr. Jenny McKay, Alan (Fox) Rogers, Peter Nagel (acting in Chris Allen's position), Di Bradford (minutes)

Item No	Subject	Action
1.	Apologies: Chris Allan; Eric Anderson; Mike Norman; Steven Lang	
2.	Conflicts of Interest: None declared	
3.	Acceptance of previous minutes: The Minutes of the previous meeting (as distributed and signed off by Graham as Chair) were endorsed with two minor amendments Item 7 – should read 'small' not 'mall'; and Glen Donoghue's surname is spelt Donoghoe.	Di to amend
4.	Business arising from previous minutes: <u>a. Report to council on lease boundaries and pathways</u> Fox provided an update on the status of his report to council. The report he had prepared for the May 18 round of council meetings was deferred in order to address three main issues raised by the CEO regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how the 2011/12 capital works budget would be spent, • the area that Unitywater would require for their proposed irrigated forest; and • the agreements to lease <p>Fox believes he has addressed these issues and the report will now be considered by the CEO and council's executive leadership team before going to council for the May 31st Performance and Service Committee and then to the Ordinary meeting on June 8th.</p> <p>The report does not propose any changes to the lease boundaries agreed to unanimously at the April Advisory Group meeting, other than the entrance to the Pathway from Pattermore House has been moved north to the point where the Armstrongs used to exit the house block.</p>	Fox

Budget:

Fox ran through the proposed budget allocations for 2011/2012 being as follows:

Stage 1A works

- \$700,000 for the roadway and car park behind Pattemore House
- \$600,000 for the first stage of the Interpretative Pathway by council included in 2011/2012 Capital Works Budget);
- \$100,000 for revegetation of the banks of the Obi Obi Creek
- \$50,000 for the detailed design of the amenities block behind Pattemore House
- \$450,000 loan to the golf club as initial start up capital

Additional design works requested by the Advisory Committee:

- \$50,000 feasibility study for the aquatic facility
- \$50,000 preliminary design for the sports field

Fox stressed that these amounts had not yet been approved and he would report back on the budget bid at the next meeting. Discussion followed –

Glen asked whether there was any proposed funding in the 2011/12 budget for Barung to develop its design proposals for the Environmental Centre. Fox stated that there was not as Eric had indicated that the proposed Environmental Education Centre was not scheduled to be built for at least 3 years.

Cr Jenny mentioned that the federal government was out and about with its RDAF funding schemes which may be suitable to Barung.

Peter Stevens asked if council was applying for any RDAF funds. Fox said that council was applying for half a million dollars for the pathways and if they were successful this money would be used to undertake additional pathway work over and above the \$600k allocation.

Unitywater Proposal

Fox stated if council is successful in getting an agreement with Unitywater work on the northern wetlands would be bought forward by approximately 10 years.

Discussion about the Unitywater proposal followed. In response to a question from Peter Stevens about whether the Unitywater would be in accordance with the Master plan Fox responded that the purpose of any agreement with Unitywater would be to:

- (i) allow the beneficial reuse of treated effluent and the development of an irrigation forest and wetland system on the Precinct;
- (ii) restore biodiversity and water quality to drained former rainforest and wetlands and riparian zones; and
- (iii) provide recreational opportunities in accordance with the Maleny Community Precinct Master Plan.

Paul asked if Green Hills could be kept in the picture as far as the Unitywater agreement goes. Fox agreed.

Paul also asked if a member of Unitywater would be appointed to the

	<p>Advisory Group. Fox said that that if an agreement was signed with Unitywater they would have a rep on the Advisory Committee.</p> <p><u>b. Finance sub-committee</u></p> <p>Discussion re the role of the finance sub committee. General agreement that the role should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing advice to the Advisory Group regarding council's annual budget for the Precinct. • Providing advice on ways of generating revenue from within the Precinct; eg timing of residential development • Looking for external funding opportunities for developing the Precinct <p>Graham stated he believed that the role of the finance sub committee needs further clarification and that it should probably meet on an as needs basis rather than monthly. Furthermore to be effective it needs to have at least one representative from outside the district and skills not already on the Advisory Committee.</p> <p>To this end he is prepared to talk to Mike Heffernan at USC to see if he is prepared to provide expert advice on an as needs basis.</p> <p>Graham to bring back a recommendation on when and how to convene the sub committee.</p> <p><u>c. Governance Arrangements / Charter</u></p> <p>Carolyn tabled a revised charter for discussion. Fox raised some concerns about the clause that referred to termination of a committee member as one of the purposes of the MCPAG is to resolve disputes and that would be difficult to do if the member was not present at meetings.</p> <p>Carolyn suggested that the stakeholder be asked to replace their individual representative rather than the stakeholder being expelled from the group. Fox suggested that suspension might be another/additional option.</p> <p>Carolyn to redraft this clause and forward to Fox for comment.</p> <p>Peter Stevens raised the potential for confusion from the statement in the Charter that reads:</p> <p><i>'For the purpose of developing the Maleny Community Precinct, PAG will be considered by SCC to represent the interests of the Maleny Community.'</i></p> <p>He believed that stakeholders represented their membership not the whole community and that other parts of the charter referenced that stakeholders represented their individual interests and membership role.</p> <p>Following discussion it was agreed to delete the clause to prevent confusion.</p>	<p>Graham to further refine role of Finance sub committee and bring back a recommendation on when and how to convene the sub committee.</p> <p>Carolyn</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Pattemore House</p> <p>Gail provided an update on the building works at Pattemore House which commenced on May 11. These works will address fundamental health and safety concerns and allow the House to gain certification as a Class 9 building and be able to be used for public meetings and functions.</p>	

	<p>The following works are due for completion by June 30.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical check, identify live wiring in roof space • Cleaning of ceiling space, insulation • Protection of pit sawn flooring and floor finishes (including lino and newspaper underlay) • Repairs to deteriorated fabric including rot to verandah and laundry floor, and leaking to kitchen windows • Bracing and tie down • Safety film to cracked glazing • Fire services • Accessible ramp • Accessible WC • Convert kitchen to lunch room • Wastewater treatment system sized for future work • Maintenance schedule & Operations Manual <p>Roger Todd is supervising the works and once completed it is hoped that the Advisory Group will be able to meet at Pattemore House.</p> <p>Graham acknowledged the excellent work of Friends and in particular Gail in ensuring the restoration and conservation of Pattemore House.</p> <p>Gail then tabled a map of historical sites of interest on the precinct that the friends have been researching and are seeking to have marked on future maps of the precinct.</p>	<p>Gail to forward a copy of the map to Fox.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><i>Engagement of Browns to develop a detailed design for the road and golf car park</i></p> <p>Fox advised that Browns Engineering have been engaged to develop a detailed design for the access road to the Precinct. The first stage of this road to be constructed will be the entrance to the precinct and the car park behind Pattemore House. There are no funds in the current budget to build the road down to the sports fields.</p> <p>DERM have now advised that they will require a development application for the road and council will engage Roger Todd to undertake a heritage impact statement as part of that application.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p><i>Update on McGarry & Eadie Report</i></p> <p>Peter Nagel reported that a draft management plan for the Southern Wetlands has been provided to council by McGarry and Eadie. This is currently being reviewed by council staff and will be tabled at the next meeting.</p> <p>Both Golf and Green Hills response to McGarry & Eadie's first report have been forwarded to McGarry and Eadie for their comment.</p>	<p>Chris Allan to table 2nd McGarry and Eadie report and their response to Green Hills and Golf at next meeting</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><i>General Business</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footbridge – held over until next meeting • Removal of Cupressus tree – Max raised the question of the Cupressus tree shading the practice green and the reasons why Golf would like to remove the tree. After discussion, it was noted that no one present at the meeting had any objection to the tree's removal. Golf and Council (via Chris Allan) will now work to determine the timing for the removal of the tree. • Bridge Club – Paul raised the issue of the Bridge Club moving onto the precinct as they are financial and have money for a 	

	<p>building. Fox responded that this has been discussed previously and the appropriate place to locate a facility for Bridge in terms of the Master Plan is in the community section proposed as part of the second stage of the development. Gail advised that Sport and Rec will be bringing a proposal concerning Bridge to a future meeting. Further discussion on the Bridge Club was deferred until a future meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Golf Course Design – Peter Stephens raised the issue of whether Golf would table a copy of their golf course design for discussion with the group. He stated that he believed the Advisory Group should review all stakeholders’ designs before they went to council. After discussion the matter was held over until the next meeting • Communication with the broader community – Joyce raised the issue that many people in the community still did not understand the progress that was being made in developing the precinct. Graham commented that even some members of the stakeholders’ organisations did not know what was happening and that we needed to find other ways of communicating than just using the local press. Discussion followed. Peter Stevens suggested that one positive way of communicating that did not rely on press release was for the Advisory Group’s minutes to be placed on member stakeholders’ websites. Graham said that if the Minutes are made available to the public then there was a responsibility on individuals attending the meetings to show cabinet solidarity and support decisions made. <p>Motion: Approved Minutes be placed on stakeholder groups’ websites in order to better inform their membership of progress on developing the Precinct. Moved Joyce Newton Seconded Peter Stevens Carried unanimously</p>	
9.	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>Due to public holiday on 17th June the next meeting is set down for 24th June (to be confirmed).</p>	