

Pacific Brook Christian School – EC23090	
Meeting Minutes	
IMS Document No. TP004	Version No. 1.01



(02) 9452 8300
www.epmprojects.com.au
 planning today, shaping tomorrow

Meeting Minutes

Meeting	Pre-DA Discussion Proposed New School at 72-74 Maitland Street, Muswellbrook – Pacific Brook Christian School		
Date	13 February 2024	Time	2.00pm
Location	Virtual (online) via Microsoft Teams and Muswellbrook Shire Council Administration Centre, Campbell's Corner 60-82 Bridge Street, Muswellbrook		
Chair	Stephen Earp, EPM Projects		
Attendees	Muswellbrook Shire Council (Council)	Sharon Pope, Director Environment and Planning (SP) Hamish McTaggart, Development Coordinator (HM) Peter Chambers, Chief Engineer (PC)	
	Pacific Brook Christian School (PBCS)	Dr E J Boyce, Executive Principal (EB) Chris Baldry, Pacific Group Business Manager (CB) Janet Walsh, Pacific Brook Christian School Principal (PL) Geoff Deane (GD)	
	NBRS Architects (NBRS)	Melanie Karaca, Associate (MK)	
	EPM Projects (EPM)	Stephen Earp, Head of Planning (SE) Kendall Clydsdale, Associate Planner (KC)	
Glossary	DCP – Muswellbrook Development Control Plan 2009 DCCEEW – Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment Department – Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure PMF – Probable Maximum Flood SES – State Emergency Services SSD – State Significant Development T&I SEPP – State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 VPA – Voluntary Planning Agreement		

1. Meeting open and introductions

SE opened the meeting at 2.00pm, inviting attendees to introduce themselves.

2. Background

SE provided a general background to the proposal, noting the prior SSD submission to the Department, its subsequent withdrawal due to concerns raised by the SES and the meeting held on 31/01/2024 with SES, DCCEW and relevant stakeholders.

3. General Discussion

The table below provides a summary of the generally discussions which ensued. Topics/themes are identified for ease of reference.

Attendee	Discussion/comments
Flooding	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DCP flooding controls more consider flooding on a shire wide basis, not site specific Brownfield v Greenfield outlined in the DCP DCP proposes to do subdivisions and new developments outside of the flood prone areas.

Pacific Brook Christian School – EC23090	
Meeting Minutes	
IMS Document No. TP004	Version No. 1.01



(02) 9452 8300
www.epmprojects.com.au
 planning today, shaping tomorrow

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Situation with the site being an existing lot with a past use and adjoining established uses Present an argument to Council on the merits of the proposal Council are not flood consultants so need specific information to consider Council would have concerns with privacy with the school at a PMF height
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood management plan and the trigger to evacuate is key School doesn't open on 'flood days' would be part of a management plan With the railway underpass is inundated, access gets cut across town Threshold can be quite below the PMF
EB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First concern is the care of students Management to keep kids and adults safe is the schools bottom line Whatever we need to do, we will do it, we accept the authorities but do not want to do that which is unnecessary
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can school be proposed on ground? (yes but not a given that approval will be granted)
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, but not a given that approval will be granted Raised school to consider neighbours
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surprised that the SES did not raise access to the school (i.e. bus companies etc) and flood management as more of an issue
GD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> So to confirm, an on the ground proposal – not saying no, not saying yes. Merit consideration.
HM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could be referred to DCCEEW, but typically flood issues are dealt with by Council. In the instances of this project, Council would be obliged to refer to the Department due to its history.
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What does the T&I SEPP say on flooding referral?
SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T&I SEPP – no triggers Council's DCP provides that evacuation plans must incorporate advice received by the SES.
HM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SES will not take referrals from past experience
SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SES said they will comment on the revised design Will be sending to SES – will ask for PMF levels and at grade – comments Preferred school scenario will be outlined
EB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School prefers ground level, for school functionality reasons Need an on-ground plan from NBRS
HM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be prudent for the project team to send the proposal to SES for comment now (prior to the DA being lodged)
Hunter and Central Coast Regional Planning Panel	
SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works will be >\$5m – as such the Hunter and Central Coast Regional Panel will determine the DA
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must be well justified, panel will assess closely

Pacific Brook Christian School – EC23090	
Meeting Minutes	
IMS Document No. TP004	Version No. 1.01



(02) 9452 8300
www.epmprojects.com.au
 planning today, shaping tomorrow

Engineering and Traffic	
SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand there would be an early panel briefing Engineering questions – project should interface with Council/TfNSW land similar to SSD project? Any other engineering matters we need to consider?
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From before, sight distances are key, traffic committee will consider, pull over bay may be prudent. TfNSW may have thoughts, footpath connections to be considered, bus movements to be considered
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buses may be brought onto the school site? To be discussed/considered further
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details to be provided for us to consider
SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic consultant to address and consider the above Stormwater matters should not have changed from the SSD proposal Reduced school population, we want it manageable, students, staff etc 140 kids. Changes result in a reduced scope of impact.
Future DA requirement and VPA/Contributions	
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address the SSD submissions in the future DA Revisit VPA and its offer.
SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VPA timing, how long for Council and the panel to consider it?
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General terms of VPA offer needed. Panel required a Council resolution for an offered to be accepted Council could also apply the 1% contribution in lieu of the VPA
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Happy to go with the 1% on the reduced scope
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VPA is voluntary and on your prior larger scheme VPA was prudent, scheme is much smaller now.
HM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1% contribution would be appropriate Barrier fencing may still be needed on the site, for consideration
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Missing footpath links being looked at by Council at the moment, may be some footpath link considerations/requirements triggered by the proposal. Council considering footpath works that may compliment the proposal
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise impacts to be considered (i.e. playground, music room etc).
SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further meetings needed prior to DA?
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, not needed.
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stormwater easement that was earmarked for going across this property – make sure it's still accommodated. Stormwater quality and quantity to be considered
SP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability matters to be addressed (i.e. new SEPP, consider water tanks etc)

Pacific Brook Christian School – EC23090	
Meeting Minutes	
IMS Document No. TP004	Version No. 1.01



(02) 9452 8300
www.epmprojects.com.au
 planning today, shaping tomorrow

Evacuation	
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is evacuation from the site by bus better?
HM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, we would see that as more appropriate
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cars are a higher risk than a bus for evacuation

Meeting closed at approximately 3:10pm