



## 15.2 Proposed Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Planning Scheme Amendment

**File:** QG290-18-27

**Report Author:** Anthony Sang, St Quentin Consulting

### Introduction

A request was made by AECOM Australia Pty Ltd on behalf of Peninsula Searoad Transport for a Planning Scheme Amendment. Amendment C23 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme proposes to facilitate future upgrading of the Queenscliff Ferry Terminal, specifically to ensure that appropriate standards of security, safety and service quality are met. The purpose of this report is to consider submissions received to Amendment C23 following formal exhibition of the Amendment.

### Summary

The purpose of this report is to consider submissions to Amendment C23 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme relating to the proposed *Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Upgrade*.

Amendment C23 resulted from a request by AECOM Australia Pty Ltd on behalf of Peninsula Searoad Transport (now Searoad Ferries) for an amendment that will facilitate:

- Separation of boarding and non-boarding vehicle lanes;
- Improved access for public transport, emergency vehicles, suppliers, foot passenger vehicles and ferry personnel;
- Bus stop;
- Pedestrian access;
- Compliance with Risk Management Plan;
- Landscaping and amenity;
- Increased formal car parking.

At a future date Peninsula Searoad Transport will seek to replace both the existing passenger terminal building and the old sheet piling along "The Cut".

Council resolved on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2011 to seek Ministerial Authorisation to prepare and exhibit Amendment C23, with Authorisation No A2104 being granted by letter date stamped 11 November 2011.

The Amendment was exhibited for a minimum statutory period of one month between 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2012 and 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2012 which has resulted in the receipt of 36 submissions, 20 of which supported the proposal and 16 submissions which either objected to the proposal or raised some issue of concern.

---



Copies of individual submissions are included as **Appendix 3**.

Broadly, **supporting** submissions from local and regional tourist operators/associations and individuals emphasise the role that the Ferry plays as a key driver of regional growth, local tourism and economic development. Many comment upon the lack of suitable infrastructure, specifically the inadequacy of car parking and the need to upgrade and improve facilities for locals, tourists and visitors. Several submitters also cite the need to support proposals which stimulate growth in the town to increase visitation. Others note that the area proposed to be redeveloped as facilitated by the Amendment resulted from sand accretion following construction of 'The Cut' nearby and that such land is infested by weeds and is not currently used for passive recreation.

In summary, sixteen **objecting** submissions from community and environmental groups and individuals expressed concern about consistency with current State and Local policies, the suitability of creating a distinct Schedule to the Special Use Zone, the need for additional car parking, removal of native vegetation and the ability to offset such impacts, land tenure, coastal planning policy implications and lack of direct community benefit. Other issues such as past non-compliance with Scheme provisions and a lack of community consultation were also raised through submissions.

From a strategic planning viewpoint the exhibited Amendment documentation argues that the Ferry terminal's proposal is consistent with State and Local planning policies. On the other hand, some objecting submitters contend that expansion of the Ferry Terminal (particularly increased car parking areas) is inconsistent with State and Local environmental planning policy objectives.

The potential for adverse environmental impacts associated with the Amendment have been acknowledged by the proponent and measures have been taken to address such impacts as part of the implementation of future works facilitated by any approval.

This report summarises each submission received and provides an officer response to the issues raised therein.

## **Report**

### ***Background***

Amendment C23 resulted from a request by AECOM Australia Pty Ltd on behalf of Peninsula Searoad Transport to provide the planning framework to facilitate future upgrading of the Queenscliff Ferry Terminal.

The Amendment proposes to facilitate future upgrading of the Queenscliff Ferry Terminal including considerations such as: improved vehicular and pedestrian access, passenger drop off, increased formal car parking, signage, security, landscaping and amenity. The Amendment also enables medium and longer term changes to be undertaken in accordance with the Incorporated Document titled: *Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010*.

---





Whilst components of the proposed works may be considered within the discretion afforded by the Planning Permit process, the proposal is inconsistent with the primary purpose of the various zones currently applying to the site. It is therefore considered inappropriate for such works to be approved by means of a Planning Permit.

Future use and development of the site is proposed to be undertaken in accordance with an approved Implementation Plan – Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010.

Planning Scheme Amendment C23 as requested comprises three main parts:

- Amendments to the Queenscliff Planning Scheme Maps and Ordinance (Text), including:
  - Creating a new Schedule 3 to the Special Use Zone;
  - Rezoning part of the land to a Special Use Zone - Schedule 3 (SUZ3);
  - Rezoning part of the land to a Road Zone - Category 1 (RDZ1);
  - Amending the ordinance of Schedules 1 and 2 to the Environmental Significance Overlay currently applying to the site;
  - Amending where relevant sections of the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) to ensure consistency;
- Incorporating the *Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010* into the Planning Scheme to guide future use and development;
- Incorporating the *Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Native Vegetation Precinct Plan 2010* into the Planning Scheme to provide for removal of vegetation, ongoing protection of vegetation to be retained and outlining actions necessary to offset the loss of vegetation in a holistic landscape based approach to vegetation management.

### **Discussion**

Amendment C23 has been subject to a public notification process being exhibited for in excess of a four week period between 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2012 and 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2012. In addition to the normal planning scheme amendment documentation, copies of supporting documents were available for inspection at both the Borough Offices and Queenscliff Library (supporting documents included a full Summary Report including: Traffic Development Plan and Traffic Report, Landscape Plan and Report, Flora and Fauna Assessments, Vegetation Offset Management Plan and Preliminary Hazard Assessment).

Exhibition of the Amendment resulted in receipt of 36 submissions, 20 of which supported the proposal or offered no objection and 16 submissions which either objected to the proposal or raised some issue of concern.

---



## **Submissions**

Submissions may generally be categorised as Supporting or Objecting submissions as follows. A detailed officer response to each individual submission is included within **Appendix 4**.

### **1. Supporting Submissions**

The majority of submissions received express support for the amendment and the Draft Development Plans prepared by the proponent. In particular, they emphasise the role that the Ferry plays as a key driver of regional growth, local tourism and economic development. Many commenting upon the lack of suitable infrastructure, specifically the inadequacy of car parking and the need to upgrade and improve facilities for locals, tourists and visitors. Several submitters also cite the need to support proposals which stimulate growth in the town to increase visitation. Others note that the area proposed to be redeveloped as facilitated by the Amendment resulted from sand accretion following construction of 'The Cut' nearby and that such land is infested by weeds and is not currently used for passive recreation.

## **Response**

There appears to be support for the Amendment from a number of local residents as well as from local and regional tourism operators and organisations as well as those on the Mornington Peninsula. The proposal also has the support of State Government Departments, including: the Department of Transport, the Department of Sustainability and Environment and VicRoads.

### **2. Objecting Submissions**

Objecting submissions include those from community and environmental groups as well as from individuals. A number of recurrent themes have been raised which are common to multiple submitters opposing the Amendment. Particular concerns were raised in relation to matters such as: whether there was need for a distinct Schedule to the Special Use Zone, whether there was need for expansion of car parking and if so, whether the proposed location was suitable for such a purpose. Proposed use of Crown Land, removal of native vegetation (both past and as proposed) and whether such losses could be appropriately offset and managed were also raised by a number of submitters. Other objecting submissions raised matters such as: whether there was any net community benefit to be achieved for the township of Queenscliff, coastal planning considerations such as coastal vulnerability to climate change and siting and design principles as well as a lack of consultation.

In summary, key issues raised within submissions opposing the Amendment included the following themes:

- Special Use Zone – Schedule 3
  - Why need for distinct Special Use Zone?
  - No exemption from Permit requirement necessary





- Car Parking
  - Adequacy within nearby areas
  - Unnecessary to cater for peak demand
  - Reconfiguration within existing footprint preferred
  - Pedestrian separation required
  - Improved public transport required
- Native Vegetation
  - Removal of native vegetation
  - Net gain principle - Avoid rather than offset
  - EVC (mis)identification
  - Habitat for fauna
  - Need for Offset to be managed independently
- Public Land
  - Loss of Crown Land to private operator
- Coastal Planning Considerations
- Non Compliance with Scheme / Enforcement
  - Non compliance with past approval
  - Removal of vegetation without approval
- Net Community Benefit
  - No benefit to local businesses / community
- Lack of Consultation

Recurrent themes have been elaborated upon below:

### **Special Use Zone - Schedule 3**

The majority of land forming part of the Amendment is currently located within a Special Use Zone - Schedule 1 (*Queenscliff Harbour*). Objectives and decision guidelines primarily relate to the Harbour Precinct and do not sufficiently provide for use and development specific to the operations of the Ferry Terminal Precinct. During consideration of Planning Scheme Amendment C16 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme it was noted within the Explanatory Report:

*“Peninsula Searoad Transport have plans to redesign the ferry terminal to improve the efficiency of this area in terms of car parking provision and vehicular circulation. This will be the subject of a separate process.”*

As drafted, use and development of a Transport terminal would not require a subsequent Planning Permit, on Condition that it:

---



*"Must be generally in accordance with Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010 and the Development Plans (to be prepared in stages)"*

Item 9 on the Implementation Plan shows a footprint (or 2-Dimensional 'Building Envelope') for the replacement Terminal Building (shown by a broken orange line on Plan) larger than that which exists. The table of descriptions forming part of the Implementation Plan sets out the following parameters:

- *To meet the needs of ferry passengers.*
- *Potential to replace existing passenger terminal building with a modern and functional building, that provides views over Port Phillip Bay and which marks it as a gateway to the Bellarine Peninsula and Queenscliff.*
- *Passenger Terminal to be a maximum height of 8.5 metres above the ground level, inclusive of any changes to the ground level required to accommodate the projected sea level rise for 2060 (0.4 metres).*
- *Activities to include ticket sales, café, indoor/outdoor area, plus potential tourism information.*
- *The design of the passenger terminal building is to consider and respond to criteria for the use and development of coastal Crown Land and the siting and design guidelines relevant to Coastal Management Act consent.*

However, Part 4.0 of Schedule 3 to the Special Use Zone as drafted requires that:

*Prior to the commencement of any buildings and works, a Development Plan must be prepared to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.*

Part 5.0 of Schedule 3 to the Special Use Zone then stipulates the following:

*The Development Plan must generally be in accordance with the Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010.*

*The Development Plan may be prepared in stages and must be submitted to the responsible authority for approval and endorsement.*

The future 'built form' of any future Terminal will be guided by the following criteria:

*The Development Plan or each stage of the Development Plan must include (but not be limited to) details on the following matters as appropriate:*

- *The location, height, dimensions, cross sections and floor area of all buildings and works.*
  - *Elevations indicating the architectural theme, including preferred materials, colours and finishes for new buildings.*
  - *Pedestrian, cyclist, watercraft and vehicular access ways, including parking areas, bus set-down areas, nominal loading bays, and any proposed off-site traffic management treatment.*
  - *Location and linkages to public transport, including provision of passenger facilities.*
  - *Adjacent areas of open space and public access to and along the foreshore.*
-





- *Security fencing.*
- *The stages, if any, in which the land is to be developed.*
- *A Traffic and Access Plan.*
- *A Landscape Plan.*
- *An Advertising Master Plan to provide for the orderly display of signage and signage in keeping with the character of the area.*

It is considered that Council (in assessing the 'Development Plan' for that part of the site containing any proposal to upgrade the Ferry Terminal Building) will have sufficient control over matters such as the siting, floor area and elevations of any building proposed to address landscape / amenity concerns.

It should be noted that the 'Development Plan' is exempt from third part notice and review (i.e. no ability to give *formal* notice to third parties). However, Council may see fit to undertake non-statutory notice to consider any comments from interested owners/occupiers before making a decision on the merits of any Development Plan or stage thereof.

#### Officer Response

The continued use of the Special Use Zone is consistent with the VPP Practice Note – Applying the Special Use Zone (February 1999). The use of distinct Schedules for the Queenscliff Harbour and Queenscliff Ferry Terminal better define the role and function of these separate land use activities. On this basis these submissions are not supported.

#### **Car Parking**

During consideration of Planning Scheme Amendment C16 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme it was noted within the Explanatory Report:

*"Peninsula Searoad Transport have plans to redesign the ferry terminal to improve the efficiency of this area in terms of car parking provision and vehicular circulation. This will be the subject of a separate process."*

Amendment C23 constitutes that 'separate process'. By comparison, Mornington Peninsula Shire provide 243 car parking spaces at Sorrento, which is significantly more than the current availability of approximately 155 car parking at Queenscliff (including 50 spaces within Harbour car park).

Whilst it is impractical to meet the peak car parking demand for all days of the year, the Traffic Development Plan provides for 129 spaces, which combined with 50 spaces in adjacent Harbour (179 aggregate) would be sufficient to meet 67% of Christmas Holiday period demand and 95% of annual year.

Car parking is not intended to benefit only the local community and/or local businesses. The primary rationale for the expansion of car parking is to redress the current deficit in parking available to those using the Ferry Terminal. Despite this, improvements to the layout are likely to





attract greater visitation and tourist experience as well as benefiting local residents accessibility from the Terminal into the Town. It should be noted that as an essential service, the ferry provides benefit to not only the local community but is also transport infrastructure of regional and State significance.

#### Officer Response

Officer's consider that the Amendment will support provision of safe, convenient and direct pedestrian and cyclist access to the Ferry Terminal. Similarly, reconfiguration of the access lanes and parking areas will better serve expected demand for supply of well designed and convenient car parking. The supply of car parking will not meet (seasonal) peak demand, but on balance is expected to satisfy car parking requirements for all but the busiest times of the year. On this basis these submissions are not supported.

#### **Native Vegetation**

The Amendment proposes to Incorporate a Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (NVPP) into the Scheme. The NVPP is supported by:

- **Draft** Queenscliff Ferry terminal Flora and Fauna Assessment report (14 Jan 2009);
- Updated Habitat Hectare and Net Gain Assessment - Supplementary Report (25 Aug 2010).
- Vegetation Offset Management Plan (1 September 2010).

The Updated Habitat Hectare and Net Gain Assessment (Section 4.1, p. 4) notes:

*"To determine which component EVC to use (and discuss offset options with a Parks Victoria representative) a site visit was conducted on the 12 of August 2010. During this site visit the vegetation subject to removal was determined to be consistent with EVC 879: Coastal Dune Grassland. Some vegetation characteristic of EVC 160: Coastal Dune Scrub was also present within the general area but this vegetation generally formed behind the primary dune whilst EVC 879: Coastal Dune Grassland formed in the foredunes and at the beach margin."*

Additionally, the Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) requires revegetation (Section 5.0) consisting of species taken from both EVC 160 (Coastal Dune Scrub) and EVC 879 (Coastal Dune Grassland). A Gain Target (Habitat Hectare) score has been derived by using published EVC Benchmarks. Refer to Submission No. 33 (DSE) for suggested Change to Section 5.0 of VOMP.

DSE support the principle of 'Improvement Gain' to be realised by revegetating denuded areas within the adjacent 'vegetation compensation area'. Such an approach is consistent with DSE publication: Native Vegetation gain Approach – Technical basis for calculating gains through improved native vegetation management and revegetation (2006).

Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP.

---





### Officer Response

The Amendment material acknowledges proposed (and past) impacts upon native vegetation associated with the expansion of the Terminal facilities. The Amendment seeks to balance development of the site against actions to be included in the Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (NVPP), including a Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) which proposes actions to offset loss of vegetation. Consistent with a Net Gain approach, DSE have supported the principle of 'Improvement Gain' through revegetation and ongoing management of the adjacent foreshore area. Payment will be made by the proponent to Parks Victoria who will implement revegetation works. Officer's consider this to be an appropriate mechanism to achieve the required offset. On this basis these submissions are not supported.

### **Public Land**

Given land tenure near Terminal, any expansion of operations requires permission to develop Crown Land. The Explanatory Report accompanying the Amendment notes:

*"The proposed development is to occur within an area that is deemed not to be part of the natural dune system, having been created only in the past 15 years as a result of sand accretion along the foreshore. The vegetation to be affected is of low environmental significance."*

DSE's submission (Submission No. 33) provides a useful overview of the Crown Land status, tenure and management:

*"The proposed use and development provided for by Amendment C23 are located on coastal Crown land. The proponent holds a current lease, issued under the Land Act 1958, for the ferry terminal area, comprising the majority of the area affected by the Amendment."*

*The current ferry terminal lease area is unreserved Crown land managed directly by the department. Adjoining Crown land comprising the Queenscliff harbour precinct and the Queenscliff foreshore is temporarily reserved for public purposes and is managed by Parks Victoria as a committee of management under the Crown Land (Reserves) Act 1978."*

*The department has offered in-principle support for the issue of a lease to the proponent in respect of areas affected by the Amendment which are outside the current lease boundary. Parks Victoria has indicated it supports the proposal. Separate to the Amendment, the department and Parks Victoria will consider the appropriate Crown land status and management changes, and Native Title assessment required to facilitate the new lease to Peninsula Searoad Transport over the expanded Queenscliff Ferry Terminal area, in accordance with relevant legislation and at the discretion of the Minister for Environment and Climate Change and the Governor in Council."*



### Officer Response

Proposed expansion of the Terminal's lease boundary will require further approval/s subsequent to the approval of any Planning Scheme Amendment. The proponent has obtained 'in principle' support from both DSE and Parks Victoria with respect to these lease arrangements. On this basis these submissions are not supported by Officer's.

### **Coastal Planning**

The Summary Report (AECOM) outlines and responds to Coastal Policies, and includes a Preliminary Hazard Assessment (AECOM 3 Sept 2010) which assessed the implications of projected sea level rise, the adequacy of the sea wall (up until 2060) and outlines adaptation strategies including: monitoring and maintenance, future requirement for detailed coastal vulnerability assessment and potential need for modifications to the structure. DSE (Submission No. 33) notes:

*"The Department is satisfied that the Amendment adequately addresses relevant coastal policy in a manner that is appropriate for an amendment."*

### Officer Response

As per the above comments regarding lease arrangements, there will be need for subsequent consent to be obtained under the Coastal Management Act 1995 (though this is no barrier to the Amendment being considered). A Preliminary Hazard Assessment has been submitted, which when read in parallel with Coastal Policy response statements within the Summary Document are considered to have addressed coastal policies. On this basis these submissions are not supported.

### **Response to Submissions - Concluding Remarks**

The objecting submissions have raised concerns about the suitability of further developing land, including coastal Crown Land for purposes associated with the Ferry Terminal operations given current environmental and landscape policies, including coastal planning considerations. The Amendment, if approved will facilitate future development which will have impacts upon native vegetation. The Amendment material includes provision for any such impacts to be managed and offset by Incorporating a Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (NVPP) into the Scheme. This will regulate the location and extent of native vegetation removal able to be undertaken and will provide prescriptions for a Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) to be implemented to offset any loss of native vegetation on a like-for-like basis.

This report identifies the major issues which have been raised within the submissions and provides an Officer Response to each. It is the view of officer's that despite the concerns raised in submissions opposing the Amendment that there is sufficient merit in progressing the Amendment. None of the issues raised identify issues of significance that would warrant the request for Amendment being abandoned.

---





It is considered that the issues raised in submissions to Peninsula Searoad Transport's proposal warrant referral of those submissions to an Independent Panel to be appointed by the Minister under the Planning and Environment Act. A Panel will enable matters raised within submissions to be thoroughly investigated and recommendations will be made to the Council as the Planning Authority. Council will have opportunity to consider any recommendations made by the Panel before deciding whether to Adopt the Amendment at a subsequent Council Meeting.

### **Council Plan**

The proposed Amendment has been prepared in accordance with legislative requirements. The Amendment is also consistent with the Adopted Council Plan 2010 - 2013, particularly those matters pertaining to each of the following Portfolios:

- Sustainability and Local Environment
- Business and Tourism
- Community Development
- Planning, Heritage and Community Assets

The Amendment will assist in delivery of the Council's Vision by improving roads and transport. Salient strategies set out within the Council Plan include:

- 5.4 Improve the development of infrastructure and maintain community assets.
- 5.5 Enhance traffic management.

### **Financial**

Other than the costs associated with processing the amendment and subsequent Development Plan/s, there are not expected to be any significant costs arising out of this proposal. All costs associated with the Panel hearing are required to be borne by Peninsula Searoad Transport as proponent. Upon approval of the NVPP and VOMP, direct payment to Parks Victoria will be made by the Ferry operator to cover costs associated with revegetation and ongoing management of the Offset Zone.

Any proposed upgrading of infrastructure to serve the Ferry Terminal if the Amendment is successful will be funded by the Ferry Operator.

### **Social**

The applicant's Summary report argues that the proposal will produce a range of community benefits such as improved access to the Ferry terminal for all users of the Ferry services (be they pedestrian, car, taxi or bus) as well as enhanced access and connectivity to the foreshore, adjacent Harbour and entry into the township.

---



## Environmental

As noted above, this Amendment will facilitate future development which will have environmental implications which have been raised as part of the Exhibition process. The Panel will provide expert review of these issues and will provide advice on whether the issues are adequately addressed by Planning Tools proposed, specifically in regard to the suitability of the proposed Incorporation of the Native Vegetation Management Plan (NVPP).

## Risk Management

There are not expected to be any notable risks associated with either implementing or not implementing the recommendations contained in this report.

## Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

*Under Section 80C (1) (2) of the Local Government Act 1989, Council staff and persons engaged under a contract provide advice or a report to a meeting of the Council or a special committee, and who have a direct or indirect interest in a matter to which the advice or report relates, must disclose the type of interest when providing the advice or report and before the advice or report is considered by the Council or the committee.*

Officers involved in developing the report have no direct or indirect interests.

## Conclusion

Issues raised in submissions have been considered in detail. In summary, key issues raised within submissions regarding the Amendment include the following:

- Support for the Amendment
  - Special Use Zone – Schedule 3
    - Why need for distinct Special Use Zone?
    - No exemption from Permit requirement necessary
  - Car Parking
    - Adequacy within nearby areas
    - Unnecessary to cater for peak demand
    - Reconfiguration within existing footprint preferred
    - Pedestrian separation required
    - Improved public transport required
  - Native Vegetation
    - Removal of native vegetation
-





- Net gain principle - Avoid rather than offset
- EVC (mis)identification
- Habitat for fauna
- Need for Offset to be managed independently
- Public Land
  - Loss of Crown Land to private operator
- Coastal Planning Considerations
- Non Compliance with Scheme / Enforcement
  - Non compliance with past approval
  - Removal of vegetation without approval
- Net Community Benefit
  - No benefit to local businesses / community
- Lack of Consultation

This report has examined these issues and has determined that it is appropriate to refer submissions to a Panel for further examination.

---



**Recommendation:**

That Council, having considered all submissions to Amendment C23 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme resolves to:

- 1) Request the Minister for Planning to appoint an Independent Panel under Part 8 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987;
- 2) Refer all submissions to the Panel;
- 3) Make the following changes to Amendment C23 and submit these to the Panel:
  - Planning Scheme Map
    - Amend Planning Zone Map No. 4 to correct a mapping anomaly by rezoning that part of the declared Bellarine Highway currently zoned Special Use Zone 1 (SUZ1) to a Road Zone, Category 1 (RDZ1) in accordance with Submission No. 36 (VicRoads).
  - Local Planning Policy Framework
    - Following Clause 21.05-4 "Other Businesses and Industry" – "Strategies" after the 2nd Dot Point amend the proposed new Dot Point: *"To ensure appropriate vehicle, bus, taxi, pedestrian and cyclist access and infrastructure is provided to the Queenscliff Ferry terminal."*
  - Particular Provisions
    - Correct a clerical error by amending the title of Incorporated Document within Schedule to Clause 52.16 to: "Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Native Vegetation Precinct Plan 2010".
- 4) Submit to the Panel its response to the submissions generally as outlined in this report.

**Councillors: Butler/Mitchell**

That Council notes the report and defers consideration of the matter to its July 2012 Ordinary Meeting to allow the opportunity for Council to hear directly from the proponent and any submitters wishing to address Council in support of their submission consistent with Planning Review Meeting protocols at a meeting to be scheduled immediately following the Planning Review Meeting on the evening of Wednesday 4 July 2012.

Carried Unanimously