

ATTACHMENT 1

PLANNING PROPOSAL

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA: The Hills Shire Council

NAME OF PLANNING PROPOSAL: Proposed Baulkham Hills Local Environmental Plan 2005 (Amendment No.())* - rezoning of Lots 3 and 4 DP 16095 and Lot 32 DP 1004057, Nos 1 & 3 Hill Road and 1-19 Colbarra Place, West Pennant Hills, and reclassification of Lots 3 and 32.

* Depending on the timing of this planning proposal in relation to the notification of the draft LEP 2010, it is possible that the proposal may amend the LEP 2010 instead of the current Baulkham Hills LEP 2005.

ADDRESS OF LAND: Lot 3 DP 16095, No 1 Hill Road, Lot 4 DP 16095, No 3 Hill Road, and Lot 32 DP 1004057, Nos 1-19 Colbarra Place, West Pennant Hills.

MAPS: Locality Map (Existing Zoning)
Proposed Zoning Map
Proposed HOB Map
Proposed LSZ Map

PHOTOS AND OTHER VISUAL MATERIAL: Aerial Photographs
Development Potential Plan (GHD)
Vegetation Significance Map (GHD)
Indicative subdivision layout
Flood & Zoning Map

1. OBJECTIVES OF PROPOSED LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN (LEP):

The objectives of the proposed LEP are to:

1. Rezone part of Lot 32 DP 1004057, No 1-19 Colbarra Place, part of Lot 4 DP 16095, No 3 Hill Road, and part of Lot 3 DP 16095, No 1 Hill Road, West Pennant Hills, from Open Space 6 (a) (Existing and Proposed Public Recreation) Zone to E4 Environmental Living Zone;
2. Rezone part of Lot 32 DP 1004057, No 1-19 Colbarra Place, and part of Lot 4 DP 16095, No 3 Hill Road, West Pennant Hills, from Residential 2(b) Zone to part E2 Environmental Conservation and part E4 Environmental Living zone; and
3. Reclassify Lot 3 DP 16095, No 1 Hill Road, and part of Lot 32 DP 1004057, No 1-19 Colbarra Place (that part which is currently zoned 6(a)(Existing and Proposed Public Recreation), West Pennant Hills from "*Community Land*" to "*Operational Land*" within the meaning of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

The rezoning and reclassification will facilitate low density residential development on the western, Hill Road frontage of the site (approximately 7900m² consisting of 11 lots ranging in size from 700 to 1100m²) and the protection, revegetation and management of the remainder of the site which is partially occupied by critically endangered ecological communities. Council intends to acquire Lot 4 DP 16095 in order to obtain full ownership and enable effective management of the site.

2. PROVISIONS TO BE INCLUDED IN PROPOSED LEP:

The proposed LEP will rezone and reclassify land as described above, utilising zones from the Standard Template LEP. Part 1 (Interests not changed) of Schedule 5 (Classification and Reclassification of Public Land as Operational Land) in BHLEP 2005, or Schedule 4 in LEP 2010, will be amended to detail the reclassification of community land to operational.

A minimum lot size of 700m² and 40ha is proposed to apply to the land to be rezoned E4 Environmental Living and E2 Environmental Conservation respectively, and a maximum building height of 9m is proposed to apply to the land to be zoned E4. Draft Zoning, Height of Building and Lot Size Maps are provided in Attachments 4-6, together with an indicative subdivision layout (Attachment 9).

A new zoning table (objectives and uses) would also be required for the E2 and E4 zones. Council would seek the Department's advice as to whether, depending on the timeframe of the planning proposal in relation to the progression of Council's draft LEP 2010, the land use table should contain terms consistent with those in the standard template, or the equivalent terms listed in LEP 2005.

It should be noted that under draft LEP 2010 the E4 zone has been used for land currently zoned Residential 2(d)(Protected) at Glenhaven, Castle Hill, West Pennant Hills and Kenthurst. Such land has been identified on the basis of the vegetative, landscape, drainage and scenic qualities of the land. The E4 zone will allow for residential development while protecting the specific environmental qualities. Similarly, the E2 zone has been applied to land with high ecological, scientific, cultural or aesthetic values such as wetlands in the north of the Shire and some Council/Crown reserves.

3. JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PLANNING PROPOSAL:

A. Need for the planning proposal

1. Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report?

The planning proposal has been prepared as a result of extensive studies and reports over a number of years including: -

- Council Report dated 14 December 2010
- Development Opportunity Report, GHD (Dec. 2009 Rev. 3)
- Flora & Fauna Report (May 2008)
- Constraints Analysis - Bushfire Report (April 2008)
- Previous Open Space/Recreational Needs studies

The planning proposal has been prepared considering the physical and environmental opportunities and constraints of the site identified in these reports, outlined below, and having regard to the most appropriate outcomes for the locality: -

- Minor drainage channels and watercourse;
- Presence of species indicative of Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest (endangered ecological community under the NSW TSC Act and critically endangered under the Commonwealth EPBC Act);
- Presence of Blue Gum High Forest (critically endangered under the TSC Act and EPBC Act);
- Known occurrence of two threatened fauna species and their habitats;
- Presence of habitat for other threatened fauna species.
- Asset Protection Zone requirements.

Council has been seeking the best outcome for the site since 1991, when Council undertook a review of its open space needs and reservations located in the developed areas of the Shire and found it to be surplus to the needs of the locality.

In 1992 Council resolved to rezone the site to 5(a) Educational Establishment for the purposes of a school, until in 1996 the Department of Education advised it was no longer interested in the site. Following this, the use of this land was not considered in detail until Council undertook a Recreation Needs Study of the West Pennant Hills Valley in September 2003. The Needs Study found that the site was not suitable as a location for an indoor sports centre, and it was not required for any other particular recreational use.

In 2005, Council resolved to prepare a draft LEP for the site to rezone it to Residential 2(a2), permitting medium density residential development, with the intention of developing only the western portion of the site whilst protecting the remaining area of the site, and significant vegetation with site specific development controls under a community title arrangement.

The draft LEP was not supported by the Department of Climate Change and Water (DECCW, formerly DEC), and consequently neither by the Department of Planning as it was considered site specific controls would not provide adequate protection for the future management of vegetation on the site.

Council then reviewed its past rezoning attempts and engaged the services of consultancy GHD to advise of the most appropriate outcome which would provide a balance between all the environmental, economic and social constraints and factors involved in the site. GHD were required to review all previous studies and undertake new ones in order to identify any development potential, recommend a suitable zoning for the site, and facilitate the management and protection of significant vegetation.

This planning proposal to rezone the site to part E2 and part E4 is the result of GHD's investigations and would allow some limited, low density residential development on the western Hill Road boundary of the site (zoned E4), which will assist in funding the acquisition and ongoing management of the remainder of the site (proposed to be zoned E2). Council is seeking to acquire Lot 4 DP 16095 from the present property owners as part of a biodiversity offset strategy to address some 4397m² of significant vegetation that would be modified or removed as a result of future development. The attached subdivision plan is an indicative representation of what may be achieved on the site.

Council is satisfied that the current planning proposal is based on reasonable development expectations and an achievable biodiversity offset strategy that will result in an overall improvement to ecological values and provide security for future management of the significant vegetation on the site. In its current state (part-private ownership and unsuitable zoning), Council is limited in its ability to effectively manage the site and protect the significant vegetation that has been identified. The attached Council report provides a more extensive history of the site and the process leading to the subject planning proposal.

2. Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?

After numerous past attempts to find a solution for the site, the current planning proposal provides the most appropriate and best option for the future of this land and the endangered ecological communities and fauna that are present.

The E2 Environmental Conservation zone provides the best mechanism for dealing with the vegetation on the site and the proposed E4 Environmental Living zone will permit the same low scale form of development that is existing in the surrounding residential area.

3. Is there a net community benefit?

The planning proposal and desired future outcome in terms of low scale residential development and extensive regeneration and vegetation management in support of the significant ecological communities on the site will provide the most appropriate outcome for the community.

Presently, the open space portion of the site is unembellished and conducive neither to any significant passive nor active recreation. The fragmented ownership of the land has also minimised opportunities to provide meaningful improvements to the useability of the site and the quality of the vegetation which is characterised by impenetrable undergrowth and weeds.

The proposed E2 Environmental Conservation zoned portion of the site, under Council's ownership, will be regenerated and managed, offering passive recreational opportunities and local linkages through the site from Hill Road to Colbarra Avenue that are not currently available to the community.

B. Relationship to strategic planning framework

1. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions contained within the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?

The planning proposal is not inconsistent with any objective or action contained within the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy or the draft NW Subregional Strategy.

2. Is the planning proposal consistent with the local council's Community Strategic Plan, or other local strategic plan?

Hills 2026 Community Strategic Direction

The Hills 2026 Community Strategic Direction is the first 20 year outlook for the Hills Shire. It is a direction that creates a picture of where the Hills would like to be in the future. The direction is based on community aspirations gathered throughout months of community engagement and consultation with members of the community.

The planning proposal is consistent with the following Hills 2026 Community Outcomes, and relevant Key Directions:

RL2 – Council's finances and assets are effectively managed

VC1 – There are places to play and be active

BUG 2 – There are a range of housing options

BUG 3 – The built environment blends with our natural beauty

PE2 – I can feel close to nature

In addition to the Community Strategic Direction, Council has adopted a draft Local Strategy together with a number of other Strategic Directions - Residential, Employment Lands, Environment & Leisure, Waterways, Centres, Integrated Transport and Rural Lands. The planning proposal is consistent with the relevant objectives and actions identified in these strategies.

Draft Local Strategy

Council's Draft Local Strategy was adopted on 10 June 2008. It is the principal document for communicating the future planning of the Shire and includes the objectives of longer term planning projects of the State Government as well as responding to, and planning for, local needs such as employment, housing and transport. The Strategy identifies a demand for 36,000 dwellings to meet the Shire's needs by 2031 to which this site will contribute.

Residential Direction

Council's Residential Direction was adopted on 10 June 2008 and aims to provide an additional 36,000 dwellings by 2031 for the Shire. The Direction also seeks to provide for a diversity of housing choice, well located housing close to services and infrastructure, a built environment that reflects the 'garden shire' image and the development of communities that offer a sense of place and community connection. The ultimate goal is to create housing options that promote sustainable economic, environmental and social outcomes for the residents of the Shire. The subject planning proposal seeks to rezone land that will provide a small amount of low density residential development whilst facilitating the improvement and conservation of an important ecological asset. The subject planning proposal is consistent with the following key directions: -

- R1 Accommodate population growth.
- R2 Respond to changing housing needs.
- R4 Facilitate quality housing outcomes.

Environment and Leisure Direction

Council's Environmental and Leisure Direction was adopted on 12 August 2008 and provides a statement of Council's desired approach for the planning, protection and management of the Shire's environment and leisure spaces. The subject planning proposal is consistent with the following key directions: -

- EL1 Protect and manage the Shire's environment and leisure spaces
- EL2 Provide high quality spaces for community recreation and enjoyment
- EL3 Improve the accessibility and connectivity of environment and leisure spaces
- EL4 Provide for public domain spaces that encourage community interaction
- EL5 Conserve the Shire's unique diversity of plants and animals

Copies of the Strategies mentioned above are available from Council's website at <http://www.thehills.nsw.gov.au/Our-Plans-and-LEP2010-.html>.

3. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable state environmental planning policies?

The following SEPP is applicable to the subject planning proposal: -

SEPP 19 - Bushland in Urban Areas

When preparing an LEP to which this Policy applies the Council shall have regard to the aims of the Policy, and give priority to retaining bushland. The planning proposal is consistent with this Policy in that it seeks to protect and enhance existing and remnant bushland including endangered ecological communities on the site through an appropriate and consistent pattern of zoning and ownership.

4. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?

The following Directions are relevant to the subject planning proposal: -

2.1 Environmental Protection Zones

The planning proposal will, through zoning and Council ownership and management, facilitate the protection and conservation of environmentally sensitive areas. It will not reduce any environmental protection standard in relation to the land.

2.3 Heritage Conservation

The planning proposal has no impact on the existing conservation provisions in the Baulkham Hills LEP 2005 or the future LEP 2010.

3.1 Residential Zones

The proposed E4 zone will permit a variety of low density residential development, consistent with the surrounding existing development. Existing services and infrastructure will be utilised for future development.

3.3 Home Occupations

Home occupations are proposed to be a permissible use in the E4 Environmental Living zone.

3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport

The planning proposal will provide a more suitable zoning pattern on the subject site. The site is located in a fully developed residential area within a reasonable distance of shops, services and public transport (buses).

4.3 Flood Prone Land

This Direction applies when Council prepares a planning proposal that creates, removes or alters a zone or a provision that affects flood prone land. Part 5 of this Direction states that 'A planning proposal must not rezone land within the flood planning areas from Special Uses, Special Purpose, Recreation, Rural or Environmental Protection Zones to a Residential, Business, Industrial, Special Use or Special Purpose Zone'. Similarly, in Part 6 (a) a planning proposal must not contain provisions that apply to the flood planning area which will permit development in the floodway.

The Flood Line / Zoning Map provided in Attachment 10 shows that a small area of flood affected land is proposed to be rezoned E4 as part of this planning proposal. This area is the location of the culvert entering the site from beneath Colbarra Place to the north. Although technically this land is currently flood affected, it is a temporary affectation resulting from a poorly designed drainage/piping system. Council intends to, as part of any future work in this location and on the site, redirect the piping and flow into the site slightly to the east, which would remove any flood affectation from the proposed E4 area. The details of stormwater design and final lot layout will be addressed at the subdivision application stage. It is therefore considered that the provisions of the planning proposal that are inconsistent are of minor significance.

4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection

Council will consult with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service following receipt of a gateway determination. The planning proposal has been prepared having regard to Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006 and the APZ's that would be required as part of any future development resulting from the proposed rezoning.

6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements

The planning proposal is consistent with this direction.

6.2 Reserving land for Public Purposes

This planning proposal seeks the approval of the Director General to alter the existing zoning of land currently zoned open space.

6.3 Site Specific Provisions

It is proposed that the E2 and E4 zones would permit the type of development that is envisaged for the site in the future.

7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Strategy

The planning proposal is not inconsistent with the Strategic Directions and Key Policy Settings of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036.

C. Environmental, social and economic impact

1. Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?

Blue Gum High Forest (BGHF) and species indicative of Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest have been identified on the site. BGHF is a critically endangered ecological community under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity (EPBC) Act 2000, and the Threatened Species Conservation (TSC) Act 1995. Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest is critically endangered under the EPBC Act, and endangered under the TSC Act.

Two threatened fauna species (Grey-headed Flying-fox and Eastern Bent-wing Bat) are known to occur on the site, and a number of additional threatened species are likely to use the site at times. The Grey-headed Flying-fox is listed as vulnerable under the TSC and EPBC Acts, and the Eastern Bent-wing Bat is listed as vulnerable under the TSC Act. The vegetation and riparian corridor on site provide habitat for a range of native (and introduced) fauna.

The Flora & Fauna report undertaken by GHD in 2008 mapped the vegetation on site, identifying areas of high, medium and low conservation significance. A copy of this map is provided in Attachment 8. The planning proposal and proposed zoning pattern is a reflection of the ecological values of the site. A small area of development potential (to be zoned E4) is located on the least constrained part of the site (predominantly grassed with low level of conservation significance), totalling an area of approximately 7,900m² with the potential to yield up to 11 lots with areas between 700m² and 1100m².

Whilst residential development would be located on the area of the site that is largely unconstrained, an APZ of approximately 35 metres would be required for bushfire management and would comprise a 20 metre inner protection area (IPA), located 5.00 metres inside the rear boundary of the proposed lots and 15 metres outside. A 15 metre wide outer protection area would also be required down slope of the IPA making the total width of the APZ 35 metres. The likely APZ is illustrated in blue on the GHD development potential map (Attachment 7) and would result in the removal or modification of around 4,379m² of vegetation identified as having high conservation significance, including approximately 18% of the extent of the Blue Gum High Forest (BGHF) community on the site. The APZ would require the removal of some canopy trees and undergrowth, with the area beneath the remaining canopy pruned or slashed to reduce hazard.

GHD have advised that the removal or modification of even 18% of the BGHF is likely to constitute a significant effect pursuant to section 5A of the Environmental Planning

& Assessment Act 1979, and that an appropriate biodiversity offset would therefore be necessary (discussed below).

Although much of the vegetation on site is highly significant, its quality is diminished by fragmented ownership, existing residential development on two of the lots, dense undergrowth and weeds. To progress a rezoning for the site presents a considerable opportunity for Council to obtain full ownership of the site and to implement effective management strategies in order to effectively protect and manage the significant vegetation. As shown in the aerial photographs (Attachment 3), the vegetation on site forms part of a corridor throughout the West Pennant Hills Valley. Council has an opportunity to preserve and enhance this corridor.

A biodiversity offset strategy is required to compensate for the loss or modification of 4,379m² of high significance vegetation as a result of the APZ. The GHD report suggests the following solutions would make up an appropriate strategy:

- Should Council successfully acquire Lot 4, the area currently occupied by the private dwelling and ancillary structures (totalling approximately 5,260m²), would be completely revegetated once existing development is demolished, to supplement and enhance the endangered vegetation;
- Rehabilitation (weed control and regeneration) of the areas on site identified as having medium significance (totalling approximately 2,834m²) to significantly improve the overall quality and consistency of vegetation on the site;
- Retention and management of the remaining 21,950m² of high significance vegetation;
- Overall protection of the site through appropriate zoning and Council ownership; and
- Creation and implementation of a Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) in conjunction with DECCW for ongoing management.

In summary, the significant vegetation lost or modified as a result of the proposal would be offset as shown in the following table.

Loss of vegetation	4,379m²
Revegetation on Lot 4	5,260m ²
Rehabilitation areas	2,834m ²
Total area revegetated or rehabilitated	8,094m ²
Net GAIN of vegetation	3,715m²

The attached Council report provides further details.

2. Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?

Bushfire:

The subject site is identified as Bush Fire Prone Land Category 1 and 2. Any development that may occur on the subject site would be subject to the requirements of the NSW Rural Fires Act 1997 and the asset protection zones. A subdivision concept plan prepared in accordance with the zoning proposed in the planning proposal indicates that Asset Protection Zones will be provided in accordance with the NSW Rural Fire Service requirements.

Flooding:

A flood study of the site was undertaken to determine the level of affectation for the 1 in 100 year flood event. The flood extent is overlayed on the proposed zoning map provided in Attachment 10. It is noted that a small area of the flooding is located within the proposed E2 zone. In this regard there is an inconsistency with 117 Direction 4.3 Flood Prone Land, addressed earlier in this planning proposal and considered to be of minor significance.

3. How has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?

The planning proposal is not anticipated to have any negative social or economic impacts on the locality. The proposed vegetation conservation area (within the E2 zone), correctly regenerated and managed, will be of significant benefit to the community. It is envisaged that the E2 zoned land would provide limited and very low impact passive recreational opportunities such as walking trail/s and signage which would educate residents about the significance of the flora and fauna on the site, and the conservation work being undertaken.

The planning proposal and eventual low scale residential development on part of the site will assist with the provision of additional housing options on land within existing urban areas, and meet the outcomes and strategies to provide for balanced urban growth.

D. State and Commonwealth interests

1. Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

The West Pennant Hills Valley is well equipped with appropriate public infrastructure such as water, electricity and sewer to accommodate any future low scale development of the proposed E4 zoned area of the site.

2. What are the views of State and Commonwealth Public Authorities consulted in accordance with the gateway determination, and have they resulted in any variations to the planning proposal? (Note: The views of State and Commonwealth Public Authorities will not be known until after the initial gateway determination. This section of the planning proposal is completed following consultation with those public authorities identified in the gateway determination.)

The previous draft LEP was abandoned in 2006 due to an objection by DEC (now DECCW): -

"DEC has considered the rezoning proposal and is not convinced that the preferred option will provide appropriate long-term protection and conservation of the endangered ecological communities and threatened species located within the site. DEC does not view the proposed non-statutory site specific DCP as a sufficiently strong mechanism to protect and manage the significant natural values of the site."

Given the past history of the site Council took the initiative to consult with DECCW whilst preparing the current proposal for the site. Although the current proposal is vastly different to the previous proposal, it was considered that early consultation would be beneficial to ensure that Council's intentions for the site are clearly communicated. The attached Council report contains both the original correspondence and a detailed outline of discussions between Council and DECCW in 2010. Whilst DECCW would not provide any 'in principle' support for the planning proposal, it did acknowledge that it was a significant improvement on the previous

proposal. DECCW did raise some concerns, all of which are addressed in detail in the attached Council report.

It is understood that Council may be directed to undertake consultation with other public agencies following a gateway determination.

4. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION:

It is intended to advertise the proposed planning proposal in local newspapers. The exhibited material will be on display at Council's Administration Building located at 129 Showground Road, Castle Hill between the hours of 8.30am to 4.30pm Monday to Friday. The exhibition material will also be made available on Council's website. In addition, letters will be issued to adjoining and adjacent property owners (and owner of Lot 4) advising them of the proposed rezoning.

A public meeting will be held in relation to the reclassification of Lots 3 and 32, in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act.

The Gateway determination will identify any additional consultation required.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICIES

INSTRUMENT		RELEVANT? (YES/NO)	(IF RELEVANT) INCONSISTENT/ CONSISTENT
<u>S.E.P.P.</u>			
1	Development Standards	NO	
4	Development without Consent and Miscellaneous Exempt & Complying Development	NO	
6	Number of Storeys in a Building	NO	
10	Retention of Low-Cost Rental Accommodation	NO	
19	Bushland in Urban Areas	YES	CONSISTENT
21	Caravan Parks	NO	
22	Shops and Commercial Premises	NO	
30	Intensive Agriculture	NO	
32	Urban Consolidation	NO	
33	Hazardous and Offensive Development	NO	
50	Canal Estate Development	NO	
55	Remediation of Land	NO	
62	Sustainable Aquaculture	NO	
64	Advertising and Signage	NO	
65	Design Quality of Residential Flat Development	NO	
70	Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)	NO	
	Housing for Seniors or People Living with a Disability (2004)	NO	
	Building Sustainability Index: BASIX 2004	NO	
	Major Projects 2005	NO	
	Sydney Region Growth Centres 2006	NO	
	Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries 2007	NO	
	Temporary Structures and Places of Public Entertainment (2007)	NO	
	Infrastructure (2007)	NO	

SYDNEY REP

9	Extractive Industry	NO
18	Public Transport Corridors	NO
19	Rouse Hill Development Area	NO
20	Hawkesbury – Nepean River	NO

SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS

<u>S117(2) MINISTERIAL DIRECTIONS</u>		RELEVANT? (YES/NO)	(IF RELEVANT) INCONSISTENT / CONSISTENT
1.	Employment and Resources		
	1.1 Business and Industrial Zones	NO	
	1.2 Rural Zones	NO	
	1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries	NO	
	1.4 Oyster Aquaculture	NO	
	1.5 Rural Lands	NO	
2.	Environment and Heritage		
	2.1 Environmental Protection Zones	YES	CONSISTENT
	2.2 Coastal Protection	NO	
	2.3 Heritage Conservation	YES	CONSISTENT
	2.4 Recreation Vehicle Areas	NO	
3.	Housing, Infrastructure and Urban Development		
	3.1 Residential Zones	YES	CONSISTENT
	3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates	NO	
	3.3 Home Occupations	YES	CONSISTENT
	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport	NO	
	3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes	NO	
4.	Hazard and Risk		
	4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils	NO	
	4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land	NO	
	4.3 Flood Prone Land	YES	INCONSISTENT
	4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection	YES	CONSISTENT
5.	Regional Planning		
	5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies	NO	
	5.2 Sydney Drinking Water Catchments	NO	
	5.3 Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast	NO	
	5.4 Commercial and Retail Development along the Pacific Highway, North Coast	NO	
	5.5 Development in the vicinity of Ellalong, Paxton and Millfield (Cessnock LGA)	NO	
	5.6 Sydney to Canberra Corridor	NO	
	5.7 Central Coast	NO	
	5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek	NO	
6.	Local Plan Making		
	6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements	YES	CONSISTENT
	6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purpose	YES	CONSISTENT
	6.3 Site Specific Provisions	YES	CONSISTENT
7.	Metropolitan Planning		
	7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Strategy	YES	CONSISTENT