Page 1 of 36

| Strategy                        | Comment 2014   | Determination 2014   | Comment 2017  | Page 1 of 36  Determination 2017  |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
|                                 |  |  |   |   |
| SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008         | SEPP protects rural land. The subject land is mapped as regionally significant farmland in the Mid North Coast Farmland Mapping Project 2008 (MNCFMP). | The MNCFMP does however allow the rezoning of regionally significant farmland where there is a need to zone land for marine based industries that depend on access to navigable waterways. | The planning proposal identifies an inconsistency with the objectives of SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008. The SEEP aims to protect the agricultural production value of rural land while the proposal seeks to use agricultural land for industrial purposes. The SEPP also recognises the need to balance the economic interests of the community by including Rural Planning Principles contained in clause 7 of the SEPP. The subject land is mapped as regionally significant farmland in the MNCFMP. | The MNCFMP does however allow the rezoning of regionally significant farmland where there is a need to zone land for marine based industries that depend on access to navigable waterways.  |
| SEPP 71 – Coastal<br>Protection | Re: clause 8(a).   | It is considered that the other relevant matters listed in clause 8 have also been satisfactorily addressed in the planning proposal.  | Re: clause 8  It is considered that the proposal is inconsistent with the clause 2(k) of the SEPP which seeks to ensure that the type, bulk, scale and size of the  | The proposal only addresses the aims of the policy and not other matters for consideration listed in clause 8. The concept design includes building with a height of 8m. They are proposed to be built on flood mounds that may be between 1.05m and 2.5m |

Page 2 of 36

| Ctuata m. | Commont 2014 | Determination 2014 | Commont 2047                  | Page 2 of 36                 |
|-----------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Strategy  | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                  | Determination 2017           |
|           |              |                    | development is appropriate    | high. Therefore, structure   |
|           |              |                    | for the location, and         | on the site may vary in      |
|           |              |                    | protects and improves the     | height from 9.05m to         |
|           |              |                    | natural scenic quality of the | 10.5m. This is significantly |
|           |              |                    | surrounding area. The         | higher than other buildings  |
|           |              |                    | Planning Proposal identifies  | in the vicinity.             |
|           |              |                    | that 'the proposed buildings  | While detailed design        |
|           |              |                    | will be out of scale with     | matters can generally be     |
|           |              |                    | other structures in the       | deferred to a DA stage,      |
|           |              |                    | locality, but a substantial   | these structures are a       |
|           |              |                    | portion of the site will not  | necessity in this case to    |
|           |              |                    | be developed which may        | shield the surrounding       |
|           |              |                    | allow visual screen through   | environment from intrusive   |
|           |              |                    | plantings. This can be        | noise. As they are a         |
|           |              |                    | addressed at the DA stage'.   | prerequisite for             |
|           |              |                    |                               | development of this site for |
|           |              |                    |                               | these purposes their         |
|           |              |                    |                               | acceptability needs to be    |
|           |              |                    |                               | considered at an early       |
|           |              |                    |                               | stage. The visual impacts    |
|           |              |                    |                               | of these structures may be   |
|           |              |                    |                               | partially diminished by      |
|           |              |                    |                               | setbacks and screening,      |
|           |              |                    |                               | however due to the flat      |
|           |              |                    |                               | rural landscape the view     |
|           |              |                    |                               | corridor is large, and       |
|           |              |                    |                               | impacts will occur.          |
|           |              |                    |                               | The impact of the            |
|           |              |                    |                               | structures is inconsistent   |
|           |              |                    |                               | with clause 8(d) of the      |
|           |              |                    |                               | matters form consideration   |
|           |              |                    |                               | which addresses the          |
|           |              |                    |                               | suitability of development   |
|           |              |                    |                               | given its type, location and |

|  |   |  |              | Page <b>3</b> of <b>36</b>  |
|--|---|--|--------------|---|
| Strategy   | Comment 2014  | Determination 2014   | Comment 2017 | Determination 2017  |
| Mid North Coast Regional<br>Strategy (MNCRS)                                       | The subject land is not located within an agreed growth area identified in the MNCRS, nor does the Strategy specifically identify the land as future employment lands. Despite this, the strategy states: "In the case of some marine-based industries that depend upon access to navigable waterways, additional opportunities for industry establishment may be provided outside the growth areas." | The Department will work with other relevant State agencies on suitable locational criteria to assist in guiding any future development opportunities. A Draft Marine Based Industry Policy has been prepared.                   |              | design and its relationship with the surrounding area. The Planning Proposal has not addressed this matter. It is considered the Planning Proposal is inconsistent with the provisions of SEPP 71 – Coastal Protection. |
| Draft Marine Based Industry<br>Policy – Far North Coast and<br>Mid North Coast NSW | The draft sets locational criteria for consideration of where marine industry land uses could be considered outside of the growth areas. These criteria exclude marine based industry on certain land and identifies a variety of   | It is considered that the subject land is consistent with the criteria. An issue of concern for the proposal is the potential for land use conflict with the neighbouring residential uses. The size and orientation of the site |              |   |

Page 4 of 36

|                       |                                 |                                  |                             | Page 4 of 36       |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Strategy              | Comment 2014                    | Determination 2014               | Comment 2017                | Determination 2017 |
|                       | side criterial that must be met | offers some opportunities for    |                             |                    |
|                       | or can be sustainably           | land use conflicts to be         |                             |                    |
|                       | managed, ameliorated or off-    | minimised via design             |                             |                    |
|                       | set.                            | considerations and onsite        |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | buffering of the development.    |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | It is recommended that a         |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | noise and potential land use     |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | conflict study for the use of    |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | the site as a marine based       |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | industry precinct be prepared    |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | prior to exhibition to address   |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | this issue in greater detail.    |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | While the Policy identifies that |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | marine based enterprises         |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | should be clustered where        |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | possible, the new "greenfield"   |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | location is considered           |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | appropriate due to the lack of   |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | existing alternatives in the     |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | location AND the ability for     |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | clustering of associated         |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | enterprises to occur on the      |                             |                    |
|                       |                                 | site in the future.              |                             |                    |
| Marine-Based Industry |                                 |                                  | The Marine-Based            |                    |
| Policy                |                                 |                                  | Industry Policy - Far North |                    |
|                       |                                 |                                  | Coast & Mid North Coast     |                    |
|                       |                                 |                                  | NSW (the Policy)            |                    |
|                       |                                 |                                  | was developed to            |                    |
|                       |                                 |                                  | facilitate job creation and |                    |
|                       |                                 |                                  | economic growth by          |                    |
|                       |                                 |                                  | providing opportunities     |                    |
|                       |                                 |                                  | for marine-based            |                    |
|                       |                                 |                                  | industries, while           |                    |
|                       |                                 |                                  | protecting sensitive        |                    |

Page **5** of **36** 

| Stratogy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                               | Page 5 of 3  Determination 2017 |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 |  | Determination 2017              |
|          |              |                    | areas. The policy                          |                                 |
|          |              |                    | includes criteria to assist                |                                 |
|          |              |                    | in identifying appropriate                 |                                 |
|          |              |                    | places on North Coast                      |                                 |
|          |              |                    | rivers and estuaries                       |                                 |
|          |              |                    | (outside of the identified                 |                                 |
|          |              |                    | urban growth areas)                        |                                 |
|          |              |                    | where marine industry                      |                                 |
|          |              |                    | precincts may occur.                       |                                 |
|          |              |                    | The implementation of                      |                                 |
|          |              |                    | the Policy seeks to                        |                                 |
|          |              |                    | ensure that                                |                                 |
|          |              |                    | <ul> <li>greater certainty is</li> </ul>   |                                 |
|          |              |                    | provided for                               |                                 |
|          |              |                    | investment in marine-                      |                                 |
|          |              |                    | based industry within                      |                                 |
|          |              |                    | the region;                                |                                 |
|          |              |                    | • industry is                              |                                 |
|          |              |                    | appropriately located;                     |                                 |
|          |              |                    | <ul><li>biodiversity, Aboriginal</li></ul> |                                 |
|          |              |                    | and non-Aboriginal                         |                                 |
|          |              |                    | cultural heritage,                         |                                 |
|          |              |                    | commercial fisheries and                   |                                 |
|          |              |                    |  |                                 |
|          |              |                    | recreational fisheries are                 |                                 |
|          |              |                    | protected; and                             |                                 |
|          |              |                    | <ul> <li>hazards associated</li> </ul>     |                                 |
|          |              |                    | with flooding, bank                        |                                 |
|          |              |                    | erosion, climate change                    |                                 |
|          |              |                    | and acid sulfate soils                     |                                 |
|          |              |                    | are taken into account.                    |                                 |
|          |              |                    | The Policy identifies                      | The subject site does not       |
|          |              |                    | environmentally sensitive                  | fall into any of the listed     |
|          |              |                    | areas where such                           | categories.                     |

Page 6 of 36

| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017   | Page 6 of 36  Determination 2017 |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|--|----------------------------------|
|          |              |                    | industries should not occur.   |                                  |
|          |              |                    | The Policy identifies further criteria which if achieved means the proposal may be found to meet the intent and definition of the policy.                        |                                  |
|          |              |                    | Criteria 1 The industry is dependent on access to a navigable waterway.  | Criteria Satisfied               |
|          |              |                    | 2 The maximum draught of the vessel, or products proposed to be built allows it/them to pass safely through the waterway and the waterway's entrance to the sea. | Criteria Satisfied               |
|          |              |                    | 3 The size or bulk of the vessels or products proposed to be built requires transport by water   | Criteria Satisfied               |
|          |              |                    | Having satisfied the three criteria above, the   |                                  |

Page 7 of 36

| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017  | Page 7 of 36  Determination 2017                                    |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|---|---|
|          |              |                    | proposed marine-based industry needs to be assessed against the following site criteria. The criteria can be taken as being met if the issue can be sustainably managed, ameliorated or off-set:  |   |
|          |              |                    | Criteria 4. Any new dredging required for site access would not adversely affect estuarine habitats, marine vegetation, fishery resources and water quality.  | No dredging is required as part of this proposal                    |
|          |              |                    | 5. The site is not located where its development would be likely to adversely affect water quality for other users or impact on water quality or tidal regimes for estuaries, wetlands, marine parks, aquatic reserves or other high conservation value habitats. | It is likely that this could be sustainably managed or ameliorated. |
|          |              |                    |   | It is unlikely the proposal will impact POAAs and it is             |

Page 8 of 36

| 011      | 0            | D. d d 6044        | 0 10017  | Page 8 of 36   |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017   | Determination 2017   |
|          |              |                    | 6. Development of the site would not have an adverse effect on oyster aquaculture development or Priority Oyster Aquaculture Areas (POAA) and/or commercial and recreational fishing                                     | likely that this could be sustainably managed or ameliorated.  |
|          |              |                    | activities.  7. The site is not located in a high flood risk precinct or high flood area.  | The site is flood prone with<br>a flood level of up to 2.63m<br>AHO in a 100 year ARI<br>event. Further discussion is<br>included in the following<br>Site Assessment section.   |
|          |              |                    | 8. Water-based access to the site would be practicable given river currents and tidal movements in the locality. 9. The site does not contain high-risk acid sulfate soils which could be disturbed, exposed or drained. | It is likely that this could be sustainably managed or ameliorated.  The site is mapped with class 2 and 3 Acid Sulfate soils. It is possible that this could be sustainably managed or ameliorated, however, no specific information is provided. |
|          |              |                    | 10. The main industrial complex (excluding the   | The concept plan shows<br>the main<br>buildings being set back<br>from the riverbank, as per   |

Page 9 of 36

| 0.000    | 0            | Data at a dia 2011 | 0                             | Page 9 of 36                  |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                  | Determination 2017            |
|          |              |                    | slipway/s), could be set      | this criteria, the boat ramp/ |
|          |              |                    | back to avoid bank erosion    | slip way is not               |
|          |              |                    | issues.                       | considered as this is         |
|          |              |                    |                               | essential for a marina.       |
|          |              |                    |                               | The site is generally clear   |
|          |              |                    |                               | of native vegetation. It has  |
|          |              |                    | 11. Native vegetation         | been used as a cane farm      |
|          |              |                    | (including riparian           | for over 100 years.           |
|          |              |                    | vegetation                    | l loi over 100 years.         |
|          |              |                    | and other trees, shrubs,      |                               |
|          |              |                    | grasses, etc) would not be    |                               |
|          |              |                    | disturbed.                    | The proposed development      |
|          |              |                    | diotarboa.                    | will conflict with            |
|          |              |                    | 12. The proposed              | neighbouring land uses.       |
|          |              |                    | development of the site       | This matter is discussed in   |
|          |              |                    | would not                     | detail the Site Assessment    |
|          |              |                    | conflict with neighbouring    | section.                      |
|          |              |                    | land uses (such as            |                               |
|          |              |                    | residential and               |                               |
|          |              |                    | recreational/tourism          |                               |
|          |              |                    | pursuits).                    | Services are available to     |
|          |              |                    | ·                             | the site.                     |
|          |              |                    | 13. Services and              |                               |
|          |              |                    | infrastructure could be       |                               |
|          |              |                    | practicably provided.         |                               |
|          |              |                    |                               | This is supported by the      |
|          |              |                    |                               | outcomes of the Clarence      |
|          |              |                    | The Marine-Based Industry     | Valley Industrial Lands       |
|          |              |                    | Policy encouraged councils    | Policy.                       |
|          |              |                    | to strategically plan for     | The subject site does not     |
|          |              |                    | opportunities for marine-     | meet the two specific         |
|          |              |                    | based industry. It states the | criteria of the Marine Based  |
|          |              |                    |                               | Industry Policy; it is        |

|                                   |              |                    |   | Page 10 of 36  |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---|--|
| Strategy                          | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017  | Determination 2017   |
|                                   |              |                    | work should use the locational criteria and apply them strategically with a view to identifying sites or precincts which are most suited to marine-based industry. The Policy also states that if more than one enterprise is likely to be established, they should be clustered into a precinct rather than scattered along the waterway's edge. This encourages maximising efficiency of infrastructure and minimising environmental impacts. | affected by acid sulfate soils, and if the proposal is approved, will lead to land use conflict. The policy also encourages 'clustering' of marine precincts rather than individual developments being scattered along the water's edge. |
| North Coast Regional Plan<br>2036 |              |                    | The North Coast Regional Plan aims to develop successful centres of employment. It promotes clusters of related activities led by local strategies. Clarence Valley Council has adopted the Clarence Valley Industrial Lands Strategy to lead employment centre development within its LGA.   | Since adoption of the Industrial Lands Strategy in 2007 the Harwood industrial area has been expanded from 0.67ha to around 18ha. This area is an obvious location for expansion of a cluster of marine precincts.                       |

| Strategy                | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                            | Determination 2017      |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---|-------------------------|
|                         |              |                    | The Industrial Lands                    |                         |
|                         |              |                    | Strategy specifically                   |                         |
|                         |              |                    | realises the opportunities              |                         |
|                         |              |                    | available should a                      |                         |
|                         |              |                    | marine cluster be                       |                         |
|                         |              |                    | facilitated in the Lower                |                         |
|                         |              |                    | Clarence. It identifies one             |                         |
|                         |              |                    | of the factors limiting the             |                         |
|                         |              |                    | business opportunities of               |                         |
|                         |              |                    | producers as the                        |                         |
|                         |              |                    | fragmentation of the                    |                         |
|                         |              |                    | industry resulting in                   |                         |
|                         |              |                    | inefficiencies and                      |                         |
|                         |              |                    | resource shortages.                     |                         |
| ocal Strategic Planning |              |                    | Clarence Valley Council                 | These documents are     |
|                         |              |                    | has undertaken a number                 | very broad and do not   |
|                         |              |                    | of strategies to reinforce              | provide site specific   |
|                         |              |                    | its current marine based                | comments. The           |
|                         |              |                    | industries and promote                  | proposed                |
|                         |              |                    | the area for further                    | marine based industry   |
|                         |              |                    | development. These                      | precinct is generally   |
|                         |              |                    | include:                                | consistent with these   |
|                         |              |                    | the Clarence Marine                     | broad strategies,       |
|                         |              |                    | Precinct;                               | except for the          |
|                         |              |                    | the Clarence River                      | proximity to existing   |
|                         |              |                    | Way Masterplan 2008;                    | industries provision in |
|                         |              |                    | and                                     | the Industrial Lands    |
|                         |              |                    | <ul> <li>the Clarence Valley</li> </ul> | Strategy.               |
|                         |              |                    | Industrial Lands Strategy               |                         |
|                         |              |                    | 2007.                                   |                         |
|                         |              |                    | The Clarence Marine                     |                         |
|                         |              |                    | Precinct                                |                         |
|                         |              |                    | FIECINGL                                |                         |

Page 12 of 36

| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017   | Page 12 of 30  Determination 2017   |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|--|---|
|          |              |                    | This document (primarily an investment guidance tool) supports a 'clustered' marine precinct that extends from Yamba to Grafton and is generally inconsistent with the Marine- Based Industry Policy which seeks that establishments are clustered rather than scattered along the waterway's edge   | The Planning Proposal relies on this document as it acknowledges that multiple sites may be appropriate for marine industrial development and supports a dispersed cluster arrangement. |
|          |              |                    | The Clarence River Way Masterplan 2008 This document supports the promotion and development of port facilities as part of a regional harbour network and maintenance of the Port of Yamba as a deepwater anchorage and working port. The Masterplan also advocates the expansion of shipbuilding and repair facilities and the development of a marine based industry cluster. This masterplan is also a broad approach and does | The Planning Proposal relies on the broad nature of this document and discusses issues with co-locating at the Harwood marine industry precinct.  |

Page **13** of **36** 

| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017   | Page 13 of Determination 2017   |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|--|---|
| Otrategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | not specifically address the issue of the appropriate location for marine based industries.  The Clarence Valley Industrial Lands  | Determination 2017  |
|          |              |                    | Strategy 2007 This document supports the expansion and clustering of marine businesses and notes the preferred area for marine industry development would be in the Lower Clarence close to existing industry, skilled labour force and with access to the Clarence River. It identified the potential for a marine industry cluster | The Planning<br>Proposal does not<br>address consistency<br>with this Strategy. |
|          |              |                    | which would involve a geographically concentrated marine industry precinct to facilitate greater interaction between businesses and facilitate import replacement and efficiency advantages. It identifies the economic benefits of clustering development through the   |   |

Page 14 of 36

| Strategy               | Comment 2014   | Determination 2014   | Comment 2017   | Page 14 of 36  Determination 2017   |
|------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Section 117 Directions | The proposal is considered to be consistent with all applicable S117 Directions except in relations to the following:  |  | attraction of other marine businesses to the region as a result of the clustering.  The proposal is considered to be consistent with all applicable s117 Directions except in relation to the following:   |   |
| 1.2 Rural Zones        | States that a planning proposal shall not rezone land from a rural zone to a residential, business or industrial zone. The planning proposal aims to rezone the subject land from RU1 Primary Production to IN4 Working Waterfront and W3 Working Waterway. A planning proposal may be inconsistent with the Direction if the inconsistency is justified by a strategy, a study, or is of minor significance. The MNCRS identifies the need for marine based industry precincts in rural locations and provides for the development of criteria for their consideration. | The proposal to rezone the subject land is considered to be consistent with the criteria contained in the Draft Marine Based Industry Policy. It is therefore considered that the inconsistency with the Direction is justified. | States that a planning proposal shall not rezone land from a rural zone to a residential, business or industrial zone. The planning proposal aims to rezone the subject land from RU1 Primary Production to IN4 Working Waterfront and W3 Working Waterway. A planning proposal may be inconsistent with the Direction if the inconsistency is justified by a strategy, a study, or is of minor significance. The MNCRS identifies the need for marine based industry precincts in rural locations and provides for the development of criteria for their consideration. | A planning proposal may be inconsistent with the Direction if the inconsistency is justified by a strategy, a study, or is of minor significance. The North Coast Regional Plan 2036 identifies the potential need for marine based industry precincts to be located in rural locations and provides for the development of criteria for their consideration through the Marine-Based Industry Policy. The proposal to rezone the subject land is considered to be inconsistent with the criteria contained in the Marine Based Industry Policy. It is therefore considered that the inconsistency with the Direction is not justified. |

Page **15** of **36** 

| Strategy                               | Comment 2014   | Determination 2014  | Comment 2017  | Determination 2017  |
|--|--|---|---|---|
|  |  |   |   |   |
| 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport | States that a planning proposal must locate zones for urban purposes and include provisions that give effect to and are consistent with the aims, objectives and principles of:  a) Improving Transport Choice – Guidelines for planning and development and b) The Right Place for Business and Services – Planning Policy A planning proposal may be inconsistent with the Direction if the inconsistency is justified by a strategy, a study, is in accordance with the relevant Regional Strategy or Sub-Regional Strategy prepared by the Department which gives consideration to the objective of this direction, or is of minor significance. | The planning proposal is considered to be consistent with the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy and the inconsistency is justified. | States that a planning proposal must locate zones for urban purposes and include provisions that give effect to and are consistent with the aims, objectives and principles of:  a) Improving Transport Choice – Guidelines for planning and development and b) The Right Place for Business and Services – Planning Policy A planning proposal may be inconsistent with the Direction if the inconsistency is of minor significance. | As these policy documents primarily deal with retail development, and marine precincts are best located away from other development and on a river and as such will usually be reliant on private transport, it is considered that this inconsistency is of minor significance. |
| 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils                 | Provides that a draft plan shall not permit the intensification of land  | The planning proposals concept site layout indicates that the proposed industrial   | Provides that a draft plan shall not permit the intensification of land   | The planning proposal's concept site layout indicates that the proposed   |
|  | containing acid sulfate soils  | sheds and workshops will be   | containing acid sulfate soils   | industrial sheds and  |
|  | unless a study of the land   | located on mounds to ensure   | unless a study of the land  | workshops will be located   |
|  | assessing its suitability has  | they are flood free. At   | assessing its suitability has   | on mounds to ensure they  |
|  | been conducted.  | development application   | been conducted.   | are flood free. It is unlikely  |

Page **16** of **36** 

| Stratogy             | Comment 2014                      | Determination 2014                | Comment 2017                      | Page 16 of 36  Determination 2017              |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Strategy             |                                   |                                   |                                   |  |
|                      | The land is mapped as             | stage, the active waterfront      | The land is mapped as             | extensive excavation will be                   |
|                      | containing class 2 and 3 acid     | interface area (ie the we dock    | containing class 2 and 3          | required for the majority of                   |
|                      | sulfate soils. The proposal       | canal) will also need further     | acid sulfate soils. The           | the construction work. The                     |
|                      | may be inconsistent with the      | detailed geotechnical             | proposal may be                   | active waterfront interface                    |
|                      | Direction if it is justified by a | assessment to confirm soil        | inconsistent with the             | area (wet dock canal) will                     |
|                      | study or is on minor              | characteristics and identify      | Direction if it is justified by a | need further detailed                          |
|                      | significance.                     | appropriate treatments. The       | study or is on minor              | geotechnical assessment to                     |
|                      |                                   | inconsistency of the proposal     | significance.                     | confirm soil characteristics                   |
|                      |                                   | with the Direction is             |                                   | and identify appropriate                       |
|                      |                                   | considered to be of minor         |                                   | treatments. For this reason,                   |
|                      |                                   | significance as management        |                                   | a decision regarding the                       |
|                      |                                   | of acid sulfate soils can be      |                                   | consistency of this                            |
|                      |                                   | adequately addressed and          |                                   | Direction cannot be made.                      |
|                      |                                   | controlled through the            |                                   | Further site specific                          |
|                      |                                   | development application           |                                   | investigations would be                        |
|                      |                                   | process. It is recommended        |                                   | required to show the                           |
|                      |                                   | however that the assessment       |                                   | impacts could be managed                       |
|                      |                                   | of the impact of the wet dock     |                                   | prior to the consistency with                  |
|                      |                                   | to be prepared prior to           |                                   | this Direction being                           |
|                      |                                   | exhibition also address the       |                                   | determined.                                    |
|                      |                                   | issue of acid sulfate soils.      |                                   |  |
| 4.3 Flood Prone Land | Provides that a draft plan        | The planning proposal             | Provides that a draft plan        | The Planning Proposal                          |
|                      | must not rezone land within a     | includes a flood risk             | must not rezone land within       | states that in 2014 a                          |
|                      | flood planning area to an         | assessment which concludes        | a flood planning area to an       | 'Palmers Island Marine                         |
|                      | industrial zone. The draft        | that the filling of the site to   | industrial zone. The draft        | Precinct Assessment'                           |
|                      | plan proposes to rezone the       | create building pads and          | plan proposes to rezone           | was undertaken addressing                      |
|                      | land below the 1 in 100 year      | raise internal road levels will   | the land below the 1 in 100       | flooding on the subject                        |
|                      | flood level. The Direction        | enable development to occur       | year flood level. The             | property. However, this                        |
|                      | states that the proposal may      | without being restricted by       | Direction states that the         | assessment is not                              |
|                      | be inconsistent if the proposal   | flooding and also without         | proposal may be                   | included with the Proposal.                    |
|                      | is consistent with the            | having any notable hydraulic      | inconsistent if the proposal      | The proponent states the                       |
|                      | floodplain management plan        | peak level impact (as a result    | is consistent with the            | assessment identified that:                    |
|                      | or if the inconsistencies are of  | of filling the site to the extent | floodplain management             | <ul> <li>the property is at risk of</li> </ul> |
|                      | minor significance.               | shown in the concept layout       | plan or if the                    | flooding from the Clarence                     |

Page **17** of **36** 

| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014  | Comment 2017                               | Determination 2017   |
|----------|--------------|---|--|--|
|          |              | plan). Councils engineers have also reviewed the flood risk assessment and concluded that it is acceptable. The inconsistency of the proposal with the Direction is therefore considered to be justified. | inconsistencies are of minor significance. | River for the 100 year ARI event; - peak flood levels vary between 2.48m AHO in the east of the site to 2.63m AHO in the west; flood velocities are generally low across the site (less than 0.25m/s); and - proposed finished floor levels of 3.25m AHO are sufficient to be above the 1 in 100 year ARI event. Advice provided by the proponent's flood consultant shows the impact of the whole site being filled above the 1 in 100 year AEP level increases inundation of a section of farmland immediately to the south by between 0.03m to 0.10m. Filling of the entire 21.2ha site is not considered practical however, significant concern has been raised from neighbouring land owners and concerned residents about the increased level of |

Page 18 of 36

|                      |                             |                             |              | Page <b>18</b> of <b>36</b>   |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---|
| Strategy             | Comment 2014                | Determination 2014          | Comment 2017 | Determination 2017  |
| Strategy             | Comment 2014                | Determination 2014          | Comment 2017 | flooding as even minor flood increases in this flat landscape can lead to inundation where buildings have been designed to accommodate the existing flood levels.  The proposal also states that a 2.9ha section of the site upon which the Marine Industry Precinct will be located will be filled and all buildings will have a minimum floor level of 3.25 AHD. With current land levels ranging from 0.75m AHD to 2.2m AHD the fill required may be between 2.5m and 1.05m in height.  A more detailed assessment of flooding and its potential impacts on all surrounding land uses would need to be undertaken before a determination of the consistency with this Direction could be made. |
| Environmental social | The majority of the subject | However, given that it will |              |   |
|                      | land is cleared rural land  |                             |              |   |
| economic impacts     | iand is cleared rural land  | involve a significant       |              |   |

| Strategy | Comment 2014   | Determination 2014               | Comment 2017                            | Page 19 of 3  Determination 2017        |
|----------|--|----------------------------------|---|---|
| On alogy |  |                                  | 001111111111111111111111111111111111111 | Doto::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::: |
|          | having been used for sugar                                   | excavation into the riverbank    |   |   |
|          | cane production. The   | below existing ground and        |   |   |
|          | planning proposal does not                                   | water levels it is considered    |   |   |
|          | identify any remnant native                                  | prudent that further             |   |   |
|          | vegetation on the subject site                               | investigation into the potential |   |   |
|          | nor any potential critical                                   | impacts on fish habitat,         |   |   |
|          | habitats. The proposal                                       | marine vegetation and            |   |   |
|          | includes the construction of a                               | riverbank stability is provided  |   |   |
|          | wet dock facility. This will                                 | prior to the proposal            |   |   |
|          | essentially be a short canal                                 | proceeding to exhibition.        |   |   |
|          | incised into the riverbank to                                |                                  |   |   |
|          | facilitate the transfer of                                   |                                  |   |   |
|          | vessels from the deep-water                                  |                                  |   |   |
|          | frontage to the workshops.                                   |                                  |   |   |
|          | Little detail is provided in the                             |                                  |   |   |
|          | planning proposal as to what this wet dock area will entail. |                                  |   |   |
|          | this wet dock area will entail.                              |                                  |   |   |
|          | The development of the site                                  | Due to the size and              | The operation of the                    | While the proposal predict              |
|          | will potentially have impacts                                | orientation of the site it is    | industry will generate                  | an ability to achieve                   |
|          | on the surrounding properties                                | considered that buffering and    | numerous noise sources                  | compliance with the noise               |
|          | in relation to noise, vibration,                             | mitigation measures are          | that will affect the                    | policy, based on the                    |
|          | traffic and amenity. The                                     | possible through the design      | surrounding land uses,                  | sensitivity of the residentia           |
|          | concept layout of the  | process to address any           | particularly the residents on           | and tourism receptors and               |
|          | development in the planning                                  | issues. It is recommended        | surrounding properties, the             | primarily the potential loss            |
|          | proposal shows a buffer of                                   | that a noise and potential       | closest being 200m                      | of patronage at the tourism             |
|          | approximately 30m along the                                  | land use conflict study for the  | away but also potentially               | parks, the ongoing cost of              |
|          | northern boundary of the                                     | proposal be prepared prior to    | the two tourist parks, 1km              | mitigation measures and                 |
|          | property. This buffer includes                               | exhibition to address this       | and 2km removed, and the                | compliance, and the                     |
|          | an existing dwelling not                                     | matter in greater detail.        | village of Palmers                      | broader impact from the                 |
|          | associated with the proposed                                 | matter in greater detain         | Island approximately 1.5km              | traffic on the locality, it is          |
|          | development. From the plans                                  |                                  | removed. The most                       | considered that noise                   |
|          | provided, this dwelling will be                              |                                  | intrusive source of noise               | remains a significant issue             |
|          | a maximum of 25m from the                                    |                                  | accounted for is a proposed             | with this proposal.                     |

| _        |                                |                    |                               | Page <b>20</b> of <b>36</b> |
|----------|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Strategy | Comment 2014                   | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                  | Determination 2017          |
|          | nearest proposed workshop.     |                    | marine travel lift that       |                             |
|          | Other nearby receptors are     |                    | transports boats within the   |                             |
|          | located approx. 40m, 60m,      |                    | site to the launching and     |                             |
|          | 160m, 230m, 360m and           |                    | recovery basin/ wet           |                             |
|          | 450m from the site. It is      |                    | dock.                         |                             |
|          | expected that noise could      |                    |                               |                             |
|          | have a significant impact on   |                    | The Environmental Noise       |                             |
|          | neighbouring properties        |                    | Assessment report by TTM      |                             |
|          | unless mitigation methods are  |                    | dated 20 March 2017           |                             |
|          | adopted. It is also noted that |                    | concludes that various        |                             |
|          | Council has resolved not to    |                    | attenuation measures are      |                             |
|          | rezone any of the site that is |                    | required to limit the noise   |                             |
|          | within 100m of an exiting      |                    | generated at the              |                             |
|          | dwelling not located on the    |                    | development to the levels     |                             |
|          | site.                          |                    | required within the NSW       |                             |
|          |                                |                    | Industrial Noise Policy       |                             |
|          |                                |                    | when assessed at the          |                             |
|          |                                |                    | nearest residential           |                             |
|          |                                |                    | receivers.                    |                             |
|          |                                |                    | To ameliorate these           |                             |
|          |                                |                    | impacts the concept plan      |                             |
|          |                                |                    | includes the use of acoustic  |                             |
|          |                                |                    | walls up to 8m high along     |                             |
|          |                                |                    | the length of the north wall  |                             |
|          |                                |                    | of the building and along     |                             |
|          |                                |                    | part of the southern wall as  |                             |
|          |                                |                    | shown on the concept plan     |                             |
|          |                                |                    | below.                        |                             |
|          |                                |                    | Some of the other             |                             |
|          |                                |                    | attenuation measures          |                             |
|          |                                |                    | required for the              |                             |
|          |                                |                    | development to comply with    |                             |
|          |                                |                    | acveroprineric to comply with |                             |

Page 21 of 36

| Stratagy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                   | Page 21 of 30      |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                   | Determination 2017 |
|          |              |                    | noise guidelines include       |                    |
|          |              |                    | limits on the hours of         |                    |
|          |              |                    | operation both for the         |                    |
|          |              |                    | development and particular     |                    |
|          |              |                    | machines, retrofitting of      |                    |
|          |              |                    | hospital grade mufflers, and   |                    |
|          |              |                    | onsite testing for noise       |                    |
|          |              |                    | levels when new machines       |                    |
|          |              |                    | are purchased.                 |                    |
|          |              |                    | The Industrial Noise Policy    |                    |
|          |              |                    | includes the following         |                    |
|          |              |                    | statement:                     |                    |
|          |              |                    | 'Responsibility for applying   |                    |
|          |              |                    | this policy lies with the land |                    |
|          |              |                    | use planner through            |                    |
|          |              |                    | taking account of likely       |                    |
|          |              |                    | impacts at an early stage in   |                    |
|          |              |                    | the planning process so        |                    |
|          |              |                    | that incompatible              |                    |
|          |              |                    | development are                |                    |
|          |              |                    | appropriately located; also    |                    |
|          |              |                    | in recognising the             |                    |
|          |              |                    | importance of maintaining      |                    |
|          |              |                    | separation distances           |                    |
|          |              |                    | between industry and           |                    |
|          |              |                    | residents. In locating         |                    |
|          |              |                    | potentially noisy              |                    |
|          |              |                    | developments, it is            |                    |
|          |              |                    | essential to recognise that    |                    |
|          |              |                    | mitigation of the effects of   |                    |
|          |              |                    | noisy activities once these    |                    |
|          |              |                    | are established will be        |                    |
|          |              |                    |                                |                    |

Page 22 of 36

|          |              |                    |                                | Page 22 of 3       |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                   | Determination 2017 |
|          |              |                    | limited by cost and design     |                    |
|          |              |                    | factors.'                      |                    |
|          |              |                    | Other relevant statements      |                    |
|          |              |                    | in the policy include:         |                    |
|          |              |                    | ' '                            |                    |
|          |              |                    | the criteria 'in the policy    |                    |
|          |              |                    | were designed to protect       |                    |
|          |              |                    | 90% of the population from     |                    |
|          |              |                    | the adverse impacts of         |                    |
|          |              |                    | noise at least 90% of the      |                    |
|          |              |                    | time;                          |                    |
|          |              |                    | if the criteria are achieved   |                    |
|          |              |                    | it is considered unlikely that |                    |
|          |              |                    | most people would              |                    |
|          |              |                    | consider the resultant noise   |                    |
|          |              |                    | levels 'excessive'; and        |                    |
|          |              |                    | the policy does not take       |                    |
|          |              |                    | into consideration the         |                    |
|          |              |                    | impacts of vehicles on the     |                    |
|          |              |                    | path of travel to the          |                    |
|          |              |                    | development.                   |                    |
|          |              |                    | The acoustic report            |                    |
|          |              |                    | submitted describes the        |                    |
|          |              |                    | existing acoustic              |                    |
|          |              |                    | environment as typical of a    |                    |
|          |              |                    | rural area with noise          |                    |
|          |              |                    | sources being birds            |                    |
|          |              |                    | chirping, wind in vegetation,  |                    |
|          |              |                    | natural river sounds,          |                    |
|          |              |                    | commercial and                 |                    |
|          |              |                    | recreational boats and local   |                    |
|          |              |                    | traffic noise.                 |                    |
|          |              |                    | The surrounding locality       |                    |
|          |              |                    | includes tourism parks and     |                    |

|          |              |                    |                               | Page 23 of 36      |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                  | Determination 2017 |
|          |              |                    | rural dwellings. Along with   |                    |
|          |              |                    | the primary impacts on        |                    |
|          |              |                    | surrounding residents, the    |                    |
|          |              |                    | development is likely to      |                    |
|          |              |                    | have an impact on the         |                    |
|          |              |                    | viability of impacted tourism |                    |
|          |              |                    | parks. Tourism is the         |                    |
|          |              |                    | Clarence Valleys fourth       |                    |
|          |              |                    | biggest employer,             |                    |
|          |              |                    | generating \$260 million in   |                    |
|          |              |                    | 2015-16. While the            |                    |
|          |              |                    | anticipated noise may not     |                    |
|          |              |                    | be 'excessive' in terms of    |                    |
|          |              |                    | the Industrial Noise Policy   |                    |
|          |              |                    | Standards, it will be         |                    |
|          |              |                    | discernible from the          |                    |
|          |              |                    | otherwise natural             |                    |
|          |              |                    | surrounds, potentially        |                    |
|          |              |                    | discouraging tourists from    |                    |
|          |              |                    | returning to these parks or   |                    |
|          |              |                    | shortening length of stays.   |                    |
|          |              |                    | The proposed acoustic         |                    |
|          |              |                    | environment will be altered   |                    |
|          |              |                    | with the business operating   |                    |
|          |              |                    | up to 7 days, from 6am to     |                    |
|          |              |                    | 6pm. The anticipated most     |                    |
|          |              |                    | intrusive noises are the      |                    |
|          |              |                    | operation of rattle guns,     |                    |
|          |              |                    | compressors, hoists, and      |                    |
|          |              |                    | the operation of the marine   |                    |
|          |              |                    | travel lift. The report       |                    |
|          |              |                    | predicts with mitigation      |                    |
|          |              |                    | measures, the impact on       |                    |
|          |              |                    | background noise may          |                    |

| Strategy Comment 2014 Comment 2017 Determination  meet the Industrial Noise Policy requirement. This requirement is for an increase of less than 5dBa within the loungeroom of the closest residential receptor. At 5dba most people can hear the noise.  The mitigation measures proposed are both costly to construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with compliance. The ongoing | ge 24 of 30 |
|---|-------------|
| Policy requirement. This requirement is for an increase of less than 5dBa within the loungeroom of the closest residential receptor. At 5dba most people can hear the noise.  The mitigation measures proposed are both costly to construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   | 2017        |
| requirement is for an increase of less than 5dBa within the loungerom of the closest residential receptor. At 5dba most people can hear the noise.  The mitigation measures proposed are both costly to construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| increase of less than 5dBa within the loungeroom of the closest residential receptor. At 5dba most people can hear the noise.  The mitigation measures proposed are both costly to construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with  |             |
| within the loungeroom of the closest residential receptor. At 5dba most people can hear the noise.  The mitigation measures proposed are both costly to construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| the closest residential receptor. At 5dba most people can hear the noise.  The mitigation measures proposed are both costly to construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with  |             |
| receptor. At 5dba most people can hear the noise.  The mitigation measures proposed are both costly to construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with  |             |
| people can hear the noise.  The mitigation measures proposed are both costly to construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| The mitigation measures proposed are both costly to construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| proposed are both costly to construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| construct and require ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| ongoing resources for maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| maintenance and monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| monitoring of machinery noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| noise attenuation. From a compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| compliance point of view, this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| this could create ongoing unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| unresolvable disputes, as neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| neighbours are affected by noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| noise which they thought they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with  |             |
| they should be protected from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| from, and the business operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with  |             |
| operators are faced with ongoing expenses associated with   |             |
| ongoing expenses associated with  |             |
| associated with   |             |
|   |             |
| Compliance. The original  |             |
| compliance measures   |             |
| include frequent noise  |             |
| testing and retrofitting of all   |             |
| new machines with   |             |
| additional mufflers or other  |             |
| noise reducing technology.  |             |
| Thomas roddonig commonegy.  |             |

Page 25 of 36

|          |              | <b>D</b> 1 11 6511 | 1 004=                       | Page 25 of 36                 |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                 | Determination 2017            |
|          |              |                    | The report was also unable   |                               |
|          |              |                    | to assess plant selections   |                               |
|          |              |                    | and suggests Council         |                               |
|          |              |                    | require that an acoustic     |                               |
|          |              |                    | consultant measure noise     |                               |
|          |              |                    | once selections are          |                               |
|          |              |                    | finalised and equipment      |                               |
|          |              |                    | installed to determine       |                               |
|          |              |                    | compliance.                  |                               |
|          |              |                    | Visual Impacts               |                               |
|          |              |                    | To comply with noise         | The visual impacts of these   |
|          |              |                    | criteria the design requires | structures may be partially   |
|          |              |                    | buildings with wall heights  | diminished by setbacks and    |
|          |              |                    | up to 8m. The northern wall  | screening, however, due to    |
|          |              |                    | of the building must be      | the flat rural landscape      |
|          |              |                    | unbroken and over 300m       | these impacts will effect the |
|          |              |                    | long. When built on the      | scenic amenity of the         |
|          |              |                    | proposed elevated flood      | locality.                     |
|          |              |                    | mounds the buildings would   | It is considered that the     |
|          |              |                    | vary in height from 9.05m    | visual impacts of this        |
|          |              |                    | to 10.5m above current       | proposal will be significant. |
|          |              |                    | ground levels.               |                               |
|          |              |                    | There are no buildings       |                               |
|          |              |                    | within 200m of the           |                               |
|          |              |                    | proposed development.        |                               |
|          |              |                    | The closest buildings        |                               |
|          |              |                    | comprise single storey       |                               |
|          |              |                    | dwellings constructed flat   |                               |
|          |              |                    | on the ground. There are     |                               |
|          |              |                    | five dwellings within 500m.  |                               |
|          |              |                    | Approximately 1.2km to the   |                               |
|          |              |                    | south is the village of      |                               |
|          |              |                    | Palmers Island.              |                               |

Page 26 of 36

| Strategy | Comment 2014  | Determination 2014   | Comment 2017  | Page 26 of 36  Determination 2017   |
|----------|---|--|---|---|
| Strategy | Comment 2014  | Determination 2014   | Comment 2017  The proposed building will be 4 or more metres higher than any building in the vicinity. The bulk, scale and size of development is not considered to be in keeping with or appropriate for this location.  The Planning Proposal states that 'the potential to screen the Marine Park through the use of extensive plantings will be addressed in future  Development Applications'. No visual assessment has been undertaken by the proponent or Council to | Determination 2017  |
|          | Traffic The planning proposal is supported by a Traffic Impact Assessment of the proposed development. This assessment concludes that the development's impact on the external road network is minimal and the performance of the intersection of School Road and Yamba Road is operating at an acceptable level. No ameliorative works | Additional work into the impact of traffic from the development is therefore considered appropriate prior to the exhibition of the proposal to address these issues. | determine the impacts on the surrounding area.  Traffic A public school is located 1.5km from the site at the intersection of School Road and Yamba Road. The additional traffic generated by the development will have an impact on the capacity of the intersection to deal with traffic movements in peak times. The Planning Proposal concludes that left and right   | The development proposed is estimated to generate 445 daily vehicle trips. Council undertook monitoring during June 2016 which indicated existing traffic of 566 daily vehicle trips on weekdays and 298 on weekends. On week days, the proposed development will almost double the existing traffic. |

Page 27 of 36

| Strategy | Comment 2014                    | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                | Page 27 of 36  Determination 2017 |
|----------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <u> </u> |                                 | Determination 2014 |                             |                                   |
|          | are recommended by the          |                    | turn lanes on Yamba Road    | When operating on                 |
|          | assessment. However,            |                    | are initially required and  | weekends, it will more than       |
|          | Council in is assessment of     |                    | potentially an upgrade to a | triple it. This traffic will have |
|          | the proposal identified the     |                    | roundabout in the future as | a significant impact on the       |
|          | need for:                       |                    | a result of ongoing growth  | safety of the students            |
|          | The development site and        |                    | of Yamba.                   | attending the school and on       |
|          | the proposed entry/exit         |                    |                             | the amenity of the land           |
|          | intersection with School Road   |                    |                             | adjacent to the traffic           |
|          | will require engineering        |                    |                             | routes. This cannot be            |
|          | details, based on the design    |                    |                             | mitigated.                        |
|          | vehicles and traffic flows, for |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | any future development          |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | application and construction    |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | certificate approval of the     |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | development.                    |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | 2. The source of any traffic    |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | movement data used and the      |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | date/time when any traffic      |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | surveys were completed for      |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | this report should be provided  |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | to confirm it suitability.      |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | Council has traffic count data  |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | available at this location.     |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | 3. Comments and                 |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | requirements from the Roads     |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | & Maritime Services are to be   |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | sought and provided as this is  |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | a Classified Road, managed      |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | by Council on behalf of the     |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | RMS.                            |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | 4. The applicant should         |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | provide more information on     |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | the type of 'heavy vehicle' (5  |                    |                             |                                   |
|          | x = 10 trips per day) that is   |                    |                             |                                   |

| Strategy | Comment 2014  | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017 | Determination 2017 |
|----------|---|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Strategy |   | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017 | Determination 2017 |
|          | envisaged for the development. The study may not adequately investigate the traffic management, operational efficiency and safety of School Road and the Yamba Road – School Road intersection given:  • A State Primary School is located at the intersection (in School Road);  • A bus stop exists in Yamba Road (at the intersection)  • Lot 1 DP652359 has an approved commercial use (not operating at present) with existing car-park entry/exit;  • The proximity of the intersection of Yamba Road – Yamba Street intersection; and Available sight distance due to existing horizontal geometry and physical environmental contraints (buildings, canfields etc.) |                    |              |                    |

Page 29 of 36

| 011      | 0  | D. d d             | 0   | Page 29 of 36      |
|----------|--|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| Strategy | Comment 2014   | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017  | Determination 2017 |
|          | Economic Benefit The planning proposal has given consideration to the economic benefits of the proposal. The proposal estimates that 100 jobs will be created in the long tenn which will have a positive multiplier effect on the local community. Council's local impact model suggests that the proposal, when fully developed, will potential represent a direct and indirect annual increase of the Clarence Valley's gross regional product of about \$11 million to \$21 million p.a. |                    | Economic Benefit The proposal will provide significant economic inputs during the construction and operational stages of the development. Yamba Welding and Engineering currently employs 20 fabrication staff. It is not known how many administration or other ancillary staff are currently employed. The Planning Proposal indicates the development would likely be producing up to 25, 6m to 35m vessels annually with a value of up to \$26M per year. This is a significant increase in product value compared to the current operation that is stated as having an output value of \$5M annually. The Planning Proposal indicates that once fully developed the development could employ 122 people on site. This would result in a positive economic outcome. |                    |

Page 30 of 36

| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017  | Page 30 of 36  Determination 2017  |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|---|--|
|          |              |                    | River bank erosion The riverbank located within the property is currently protected by rock armouring constructed by Clarence Valley Council to provide low level erosion prevention on the site. The concept plan identifies a 20m wide basin that will be required to the cut into the rock armouring wall and the Planning Proposal discusses a 14m wide boat ramp. The boat ramp is not shown on the concept plan. The Planning Proposal states that 'the provision of sophisticated riverbank works to protect high-value assets within the Marine Park is critical' and that the owner will be responsible for the design, construction and maintenance of all bank protection structures which will eliminate the need for any Council responsibility, particularly in respect of maintenance. | The development site is also within 900m of land identified by Council as being a Riverbank Erosion Area. If a gateway determination is issued an engineering assessment should be undertaken prior to the making of the plan to determine the bank stability at this site and any required mitigation measures. |

|          |              |                    |  | Page 31 of 30  |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017   | Determination 2017   |
|          |              |                    | Infrastructure It is expected the site can be adequately serviced. The Planning Proposal states that water, power and telecommunications are located immediately adjoining the property and will be extended/upgraded as required at the owner's expense.  School Road is a local road and may require upgrading to cater for increased traffic movements. In addition, the intersection of School Road and Yamba Road will require significant upgrading. The Traffic and Transport Assessment that supports the Planning Proposal concludes that left and right turn lanes on Yamba Road are initially required and potentially an upgrade to a roundabout in the future as a result of ongoing growth of Yamba.  Council's Development Engineer reviewed the information provided with the Planning | This matter can be addressed should this proposal progress to development application stage. |

Page **32** of **36** 

| Strategy | Comment 2014  | Determination 2014 | Comment 2017                   | Page 32 of 36  Determination 2017 |
|----------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Otratogy | Johnnent 2014 |                    | Proposal and determined        | Dotter initiation 2017            |
|          |               |                    | that the proposed              |                                   |
|          |               |                    | intersection treatment         |                                   |
|          |               |                    | would fail during the          |                                   |
|          |               |                    | morning and afternoon          |                                   |
|          |               |                    | peak once the site is fully    |                                   |
|          |               |                    | developed and that a           |                                   |
|          |               |                    | roundabout                     |                                   |
|          |               |                    | intersection treatment will    |                                   |
|          |               |                    | function to an acceptable      |                                   |
|          |               |                    | level of service. Council      |                                   |
|          |               |                    | determined                     |                                   |
|          |               |                    | that a sensitivity analysis    |                                   |
|          |               |                    | must be undertaken to          |                                   |
|          |               |                    | determine when the             |                                   |
|          |               |                    | intersection treatment         |                                   |
|          |               |                    | would fail and determine       |                                   |
|          |               |                    | when the roundabout would      |                                   |
|          |               |                    | be required to be built. A     |                                   |
|          |               |                    | roundabout at the              |                                   |
|          |               |                    | intersection of School Road    |                                   |
|          |               |                    | and Yamba Road would           |                                   |
|          |               |                    | require land acquisition to    |                                   |
|          |               |                    | occur. Below are extracts      |                                   |
|          |               |                    | from the Planning Proposal     |                                   |
|          |               |                    | showing the proposed           |                                   |
|          |               |                    | intersection                   |                                   |
|          |               |                    | treatments.                    |                                   |
|          |               |                    | Company units                  |                                   |
|          |               |                    | Community The Planning Present | Due the neture of the             |
|          |               |                    | The Planning Proposal          | Due the nature of the             |
|          |               |                    | does not stipulate an          | development and                   |
|          |               |                    | exhibition period for          | contentious history within        |
|          |               |                    | community consultation.        | the community a minimum           |

Page **33** of **36** 

|          |              |  |  | Page 33 of 36  |
|----------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014   | Comment 2017   | Determination 2017   |
|          |              |  |  | 28-day exhibition period would be necessary if the proposal is supported.  |
|          |              |  | The Planning Proposal identifies that consultation with the following agencies would be undertaken:  • Roads & Maritime Services;  • Fisheries;  • Office of Environment & Heritage; and  • Office of Water. |  |
|          |              | It is recommended that; 1. The planning proposal should proceed. 2. Prior to exhibition the planning proposal is to be amended as follows: a. land within 100m of an existing dwelling not located on the site shall be removed form the proposed IN4 Zone; b. a project timeline demonstrating that the proposal can be finalised |  | It is recommended that this Planning Proposal not be supported. Therefore, no timeframe for its completion is recommended. If this planning proposal was to be supported it is recommended a 12 month timeframe be required. No project timeframe was submitted with the proposal. |
|          |              | within a 12 month period shall<br>be included; and<br>c. inclusion of the proposed<br>marine based industry clause<br>from the Departments Draft   |  | Council has sought delegations to progress this Planning Proposal, however, it is recommended that this  |

Page **34** of **36** 

|          |              |                                |              | Page <b>34</b> of <b>36</b>   |
|----------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014             | Comment 2017 | Determination 2017            |
|          |              | Marine Based Industry Policy   |              | Planning Proposal not be      |
|          |              | -Far North Coast and Mid       |              | supported. Therefore, no      |
|          |              | North Coast NSW shall be       |              | delegations will need to be   |
|          |              | included to ensure the site is |              | issued.                       |
|          |              | utilised only by genuine       |              | If this proposal is supported |
|          |              | marine based and associated    |              | it is recommended that        |
|          |              | industries.                    |              | delegations be issued to      |
|          |              | 3. That the following studies  |              | Clarence Valley Council as    |
|          |              | are completed and included     |              | requested.                    |
|          |              | with the material to be placed |              |                               |
|          |              | on exhibition with the         |              | CONCLUSION                    |
|          |              | planning proposal;             |              | The Lower Clarence locality   |
|          |              | a. An assessment of the        |              | provides a suitable location  |
|          |              | impact the 'wet dock' will     |              | for the expansion of marine   |
|          |              | have on the hydrology of the   |              | based industries and that     |
|          |              | area, river bank stability,    |              | the proponent behind this     |
|          |              | aquatic habitats and acid      |              | proposal has established a    |
|          |              | sulfate soils.                 |              | strong business which can     |
|          |              | b. Additional traffic          |              | contribute to the ongoing     |
|          |              | assessment that considered     |              | growth of the local           |
|          |              | business as well as employee   |              | economy. The potential        |
|          |              | traffic generation including a |              | provision of 122 jobs would   |
|          |              | more detailed assessment of    |              | be beneficial to the regional |
|          |              | likely intersection            |              | economy.                      |
|          |              | requirements at School Road    |              | However, both the local       |
|          |              | and Yamba Road.                |              | and Regional strategic        |
|          |              | c. A noise and potential land  |              | planning documents            |
|          |              | use conflict study due to the  |              | support the clustering of a   |
|          |              | location of nearby residential |              | marine precinct to            |
|          |              | housing.                       |              | encourage a skilled           |
|          |              | The planning proposal is to    |              | workforce, reduce             |
|          |              | be completed within 12         |              | infrastructure demands and    |
|          |              | months.                        |              | prevent industries scattered  |
|          |              |                                |              | along the water's edge. In    |

Page **35** of **36** 

| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014             | Comment 2017 | Page 35 of 36  Determination 2017 |
|----------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
|          |              | 5. That a community            |              | July 2015 additional land         |
|          |              | consultation period of 28 days |              | was zoned to provide for          |
|          |              | is necessary.                  |              | this expansion.                   |
|          |              | 6. That the RPA consult with   |              | Independent advice                |
|          |              | the following State Agencies   |              | obtained indicates that           |
|          |              | a. Roads and Maritime          |              | there is no physical need         |
|          |              | Services in relation to road   |              | for this development to be        |
|          |              | access and maritime issues     |              | located away from the             |
|          |              | b. NSW Office of               |              | existing zoned land.              |
|          |              | Environment and Heritage       |              | In addition, the site itself is   |
|          |              | c. Department of Primary       |              | mapped as regionally              |
|          |              | Industries - Fisheries and     |              | significant farmland, and is      |
|          |              | Aquaculture                    |              | located within an                 |
|          |              | d. Department of Primary       |              | established rural zone,           |
|          |              | Industries – Agriculture       |              | within proximity to nature        |
|          |              | 7. It is recommended that a    |              | based tourism operators.          |
|          |              | delegate of the Director       |              | The supporting studies            |
|          |              | General agree that the         |              | have not demonstrated that        |
|          |              | inconsistencies of the         |              | the impacts of this proposal      |
|          |              | proposal with S117 Directions  |              | can be successfully               |
|          |              | 1.2, 3.4, 4.1 and 4.3 are      |              | mitigated.                        |
|          |              | justified in accordance with   |              | Key issues arise from the         |
|          |              | the provisions of the          |              | assessment including              |
|          |              | Directions.                    |              | potential ongoing impacts         |
|          |              | The reasons for the            |              | from noise and traffic. In        |
|          |              | recommendation are as          |              | addition, the visual impacts      |
|          |              | follows;                       |              | on the rural landscape are        |
|          |              | The development of a           |              | not adequately dealt with.        |
|          |              | marine industry precinct on    |              | Considering the above it is       |
|          |              | the Clarence River is          |              | recommended this proposal         |
|          |              | supported by local and         |              | not be supported and the          |
|          |              | regional strategies and offers |              | proponent be encouraged           |
|          |              | significant economic and       |              | to consider the existing          |

|          |              |   |              | Page <b>36</b> of <b>36</b>  |
|----------|--------------|---|--------------|--|
| Strategy | Comment 2014 | Determination 2014  | Comment 2017 | Determination 2017   |
|          |              | employment opportunities for the area.  2. The proposal is generally consistent with the broader strategic planning framework for the site subject to further investigation of specific site constraints and potential development impacts are necessary. |              | zoned land for this business expansion. RECOMMENDATION It is recommended that the delegate of the Minister for Planning, determine that the planning proposal should not proceed because:  1. there is no demonstrated need for additional zoned land in this location;  2. it is inconsistent with: a. the Clarence Valley Industrial Lands Policy, and as such the North Coast Regional Plan 2036; and b. the Marine Based Industry Policy- Far North Coast and Mid North Coast NSW;  3. it is inconsistent with SEPP 71 - Coastal Protection, and section 117 Direction 1.2 Rural Zones; and  4. the potential noise and visual impacts on the amenity of the surrounding locality are considered unacceptable. |
|          |              |   |              | <ol> <li>it is inconsistent with:</li> <li>a. the Clarence Valley Industrial Lands Policy, and as such the North Coast Regional Plan 2036; and</li> <li>b. the Marine Based Industry Policy- Far North Coast and Mid North Coast NSW;</li> <li>it is inconsistent with SEPP 71 - Coastal Protection, and section 11.</li> </ol>  |
|          |              |   |              | and 4. the potential noise and visual impacts on the amenity of the surrounding locality are considered  |