

	<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Rosewood Showgrounds Land Management Plan Public Meeting - AGENDA</b>		
	<b>Date</b>	27 February 2019	<b>Time</b>	6pm-8pm
	<b>Location</b>	Rosewood Cultural Centre (1 Railway St, Rosewood)		

**Facilitator:** Zanthea Chulio, Engagement Plus

**Council staff attending:**  
John Bolton, Principal Officer, Sport & Recreation Program  
Brett McGrath, ICC Property Branch

**Public attending:**  
Forty-one (41) people attended the meeting including representatives from:

- Rosewood Craft and Quilters (2)
- Rosewood Lions (18)
- Rosewood Men’s Shed (5)
- Rosewood Community Centre (6)
- Rosewood Show Society (5)

Agenda Item		Key Points
	<b>Introduction to the LMP</b>	<p>Brett McGrath, Property Branch Ipswich City Council provided an overview of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the current context of the Rosewood Showground site showing the draft Master Plan</li> <li>• the role of the State Government and their expectations surrounding a proposal with inconsistent uses to the current LMP such as camping length extension and a men's shed</li> <li>• the development process and conditions</li> <li>• overview of the previous engagement and how it relates to the draft LMP</li> <li>• the role of the Ipswich City Council and recommendations to the State</li> <li>• the level of authority the State has on approving the recommendations contained in the draft LMP</li> </ul>
	<b>Proposed changes to the site</b>	<p>John Bolton from ICC provided an overview on the reason for the meeting to discuss the Men's Shed and for this to be included in the draft LMP with the approved changes to the camping ground length of stay recommendation. It was outlined at the last meeting to allow the number of nights for campers from 3 nights (Council currently allows 7 nights) to 14 nights and how this relates to the Men's Shed proposal. John acknowledged an error in a paragraph on draft LMP which wasn't clear on the delineation between the Lion's shed and the Men's shed. Members of the Lion's requested to be part of the drafting of the new paragraph.</p>
	<b>Exploring further – your say</b>	<p>Participants were asked to consider the proposal and discuss the following key questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are some of the positives of introducing a Men's Shed on site?</li> <li>• What are some of the negatives of introducing a Men's Shed on site?</li> </ul>

Agenda Item	Key Points
	<p>Participants were asked to record their thoughts and suggestions on the two sheets of butcher's paper provided at each table. This was not a popular activity by the group and a suggestion by the group to discuss options for the location of the Men's Shed was moved instead.</p> <p>John discussed that Council had four options for potential locations of the Men's Shed and that they were concept only.</p> <p>John outlined each option on the design master plan contained in attendee handouts and went around the group and identified each option location. John also discussed that the shed will be managed by Council but approved by the State and that the building on the land stays with the land and will be a Council asset if the Men's Shed folded.</p> <p>After each option, the group came together for an open discussion on the positives and negatives of this location which was recorded by Zanthia on the flip chart in the middle of the room.</p> <p>Key points that were recorded by the groups for each option included:</p> <p><b>Option 1:</b>  <u>Positives:</u>          No positives recorded.  <u>Concerns:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restricts turning circle for trucks when the show is on</li> <li>• Lack of proximity to power/sewer/water services</li> <li>• Reduces the number of existing parking</li> <li>• Increase stormwater runoff to surrounding areas</li> </ul> </p> <p><b>Option 2: was not supported by anyone</b></p> <p><b>Option 3 (opposite Lion's shed inside existing cattle yard):</b>  <u>Positives:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate parking</li> <li>• Works for turning circles</li> <li>• Services closer than other options</li> <li>• Create boundary for campers/school children who stay at showgrounds</li> <li>• Activate the area</li> <li>• Less impact/contained within certain area</li> <li>• Proximity to residential uses</li> </ul> <u>Concerns:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Busy at times, area is already used extensively</li> <li>• Environmental factors such as smell/noise</li> <li>• Capacity for development</li> </ul> </p>

Agenda Item	Key Points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non powered site</li> </ul> <p><b>Option 4 (near entrance to showgrounds):</b></p> <p><u>Positives:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Links with existing all weathered parking and sealed pathways</li> <li>• Access to existing amenities</li> <li>• Profile raising due to proximity to the main road and train line</li> <li>• Good location for signage</li> <li>• Proximity to deliberator at public toilets</li> <li>• Good distance to residential uses</li> </ul> <p><u>Concerns:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from shed on hall</li> <li>• Removal of showground feel and aesthetic</li> <li>• Reduces the use of a men's shed if they can't make noise</li> <li>• Train noise on shed use</li> </ul> <p>If further location details for each option is needed, John and Council staff have this information on record.</p>
<p><b>Mitigating risks and issues</b></p>	<p>Participants were asked to consider the points raised by the group and particularly some of the concerns raised about each option location. An open discussion after each option occurred and was recorded by Zanthia. In addition to the above comments, the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A request for a copy of the existing LMP to be sent to Pat and Lion's Club president</li> <li>• Discussion by John around Council's capital works program and how funding is allocated within Council. This was in response to claims by attendees that approved development on site had not been built yet</li> <li>• Frustration that regular user group meetings were no longer occurring at Showgrounds</li> <li>• The services (power, sewer, stormwater) put in place for the Lion's shed was borne by the club and therefore did not want to share connection</li> <li>• Request by attendees for another public meeting and review of final report/recommendation by Council before next step in approval process</li> <li>• Lion's Club raised concerns of noise in Men's Shed and how that would negatively impact on livestock and campers</li> <li>• Concern that there wasn't enough space at the Showgrounds to host a Men's Shed especially during Show times</li> <li>• Query on how the Men's Shed received funding when they didn't have a parcel of land approved for this type of use</li> <li>• A request to reword a paragraph on P11 to reinstate that the Men's Shed at the Community Centre reached capacity and that is why it had to move</li> <li>• Train noise was not seen as a major issue</li> </ul>

Agenda Item		Key Points
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mrs Alison Young, MP rep from State Government outlined the Grant conditions and approval processes when the Men's Shed funding was queried</li> </ul>
	<b>Where to from here?</b>	<p>Key points shared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All comments made tonight have been recorded and will be collated and documented for submission with the application</li> <li>Any further thoughts can be recorded on the hardcopy survey's - to be handed in at the end of the night, or take them away and either scan and email through to <a href="mailto:council@ipswich.qld.gov.au">council@ipswich.qld.gov.au</a> , or post to the address on the bottom of the form by COB Friday (1<sup>st</sup> March).</li> <li>An online survey is also still available for comments for those who are not able to be here today – this can be found on the Council website.</li> <li>Once all responses have been received, all will be collated and submitted with the application to the Department of Natural Resources and Mines</li> <li>Upon receipt of a response from the Department of Natural Resources and Mines, participants will receive notification of the outcome of the project.</li> </ul>
	<b>Meeting closed at 8.00pm</b>	

Summary from the seven survey responses from the public meeting include:

- Of the seven responses, four indicated they were either strongly opposed (1) or opposed (3) with the other three supported (1) or strongly supported (2) the proposal;
- Two requests to have another meeting before report goes to State government;
- Two people gave their support to Option 4;
- Two responses outlined the need for men's shed and how they help all men to improve their wellbeing and mental health especially retired men; and
- One person concerned that two Men's Sheds in Rosewood are too many.