

Gunnedah LEP 1998 - Change in definition of flood prone land.						
Proposal Title : Gunnedah LEP 1998 - Change in definition of flood prone land.						
Proposal Summary :	This Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Gunnedah LEP 1998 by changing the definition of flood prone land to take into account recent studies and reports that provide more accurate information on potential flood behaviour in Gunnedah.					
PP Number :	PP_2011_GUNNE_003_00	Dop File No :	11/16719			
Proposal Details						
Date Planning Proposal Received :	08-Sep-2011	LGA covered :	Gunnedah			
Region :	Northern	RPA :	Gunnedah Shire Council			
State Electorate :	TAMWORTH	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal			
LEP Type :	Policy					
Location Details						
Street :						
Suburb : Gu	nnedah City	y :	Postcode : 2380			
Land Parcel : Th	is Planning Proposal applies	to the entire Shire.				
DoP Planning Offi	cer Contact Details					
Contact Name :	Jon Stone					
Contact Number :	0267019688					
Contact Email :	jon.stone@planning.nsw.go	ov.au				
RPA Contact Deta	ils					
Contact Name :	Carolyn Hunt					
Contact Number :	0267402122					
Contact Email :	carolynhunt@infogunnedah	n.com.au				
DoP Project Mana	ger Contact Details					
Contact Name :						
Contact Number :						
Contact Email :						
Land Release Data	3					
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A			
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	N/A	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes			

MDP Number :		Date of Release :			
Area of Release (Ha) :	0.00	Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	N/A		
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	0		
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created	0		
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes				
If No, comment :	To the best of the Regional Team's knowledge the NSW Government Lobbyist Code of Conduct has been complied with.				
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists?	Νο				
If Yes, comment :					
upporting notes					
Internal Supporting Notes :					
External Supporting Notes :	dating back to 1978.	of flood prone land in the Gunnedah More recent flood studies and analysi	s has provided greater accuracy		
	-	reflects the most recent and accurate	ishes to have a definition of information available.		
Accessmon	flood prone land that	-			
	flood prone land that	-			
tatement of the ob	flood prone land that	-			
tatement of the ob	flood prone land that it jectives - s55(2)(a) ojectives provided? Yes The Planning Prop	-	information available.		
tatement of the ob Is a statement of the ob Comment :	flood prone land that it jectives - s55(2)(a) ojectives provided? Yes The Planning Prop	reflects the most recent and accurate osal clearly states that its objective is Gunnedah LEP 1998.	information available.		
tatement of the ob Is a statement of the ob Comment : Explanation of prov	flood prone land that jectives - s55(2)(a) ojectives provided? Yes The Planning Prop prone land' in the C isions provided - si	reflects the most recent and accurate osal clearly states that its objective is Gunnedah LEP 1998.	information available.		
itatement of the ob- ls a statement of the ob- Comment : Explanation of provision o	flood prone land that jectives - s55(2)(a) ojectives provided? Yes The Planning Prop prone land' in the C isions provided - se ivisions provided? Yes The Planning Prop	reflects the most recent and accurate osal clearly states that its objective is Gunnedah LEP 1998.	information available. to amend the definition of 'flood		
Comment :	flood prone land that jectives - s55(2)(a) ojectives provided? Yes The Planning Prop prone land' in the C isions provided - se visions provided? Yes The Planning Prop achieved through a	reflects the most recent and accurate osal clearly states that its objective is Gunnedah LEP 1998. 55(2)(b) osal clearly explains the intended out	to amend the definition of 'flood come of the amendment will be one land' in the LEP.		
itatement of the ob- ls a statement of the ob- Comment : Explanation of provision o	flood prone land that jectives - s55(2)(a) ojectives provided? Yes The Planning Prop prone land' in the C isions provided - se ivisions provided? Yes The Planning Prop achieved through a The currrent defini "flood prone land r Inundation Map dar Flood Prone Land"	reflects the most recent and accurate osal clearly states that its objective is Sunnedah LEP 1998. 55(2)(b) osal clearly explains the intended out an alteration to the definition 'flood pr	information available.		
tatement of the ob Is a statement of the ob Comment : Explanation of prov Is an explanation of prov	flood prone land that jectives - s55(2)(a) ojectives provided? Yes The Planning Prop prone land' in the C isions provided? Yes The Planning Prop achieved through a The currrent definit "flood prone land r lnundation Map dat Flood Prone Land" be affected by the	reflects the most recent and accurate osal clearly states that its objective is Gunnedah LEP 1998. 55(2)(b) osal clearly explains the intended out an alteration to the definition 'flood pr tion of 'flood prone land' in Gunnedat neans land identified as being within ted 1978 related to the Council's "Inte and available at the office of the Cou	information available.		

Justification - s55 (2))(c)		
a) Has Council's strategy	y been agreed to by the I	Director General? Yes	
b) S.117 directions identi	ified by RPA :	3.1 Residential Zones	
* May need the Director	General's agreement	4.3 Flood Prone Land 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements	
Is the Director Genera	al's agreement required?	'Yes	
c) Consistent with Stand	ard Instrument (LEPs) O	rder 2006 : No	
d) Which SEPPs have th	e RPA identified?	SEPP No 1—Development Standards SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008	
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	Council has identifi with the provisions	ied that while these SEPPs apply, the Planning Proposal is consistent s of the SEPPs.	
Have inconsistencies wit	th items a), b) and d) bei	ng adequately justified? No	
If No, explain :	The Planning Prop Prone Land which Land Policy and th arises due to the u Probable Maximum	osal is considered to be inconsistent with s117 Direction 4.3 Flood requires LEP provisions to be consistent with the NSW Flood Prone e Floodplain Development Manual (FDM) 2005. This inconsistency se of the term "flood liable land" which in the FDM 2005 relates to the n Flood (PFM) event rather than the 1% Annual Exceedance Event ure to include a 0.5m freeboard in the area affected by flood related	
Mapping Provided - s	s55(2)(d)		
Is mapping provided? No	2		
Comment :	No mapping has been included in the Planning Proposal. It is noted that no mapping will be required for the legal drafting of the amendment as the proposal will be achieved by the alteration of wording in the written instrument.		
	important that the r be placed on public	ot required for the legal drafting of the amendment, it is considered maps illustrating the affected land are included in the information to c exhibition. This will help the community to better understand the equences of the proposal.	
Community consulta	important that the r be placed on public changes and conse	naps illustrating the affected land are included in the information to c exhibition. This will help the community to better understand the	
Community consultat Has community consultat	important that the r be placed on public changes and conse ition - s55(2)(e)	naps illustrating the affected land are included in the information to c exhibition. This will help the community to better understand the equences of the proposal.	
	important that the r be placed on public changes and conse ation - s55(2)(e) tion been proposed? Yes Council has propos	naps illustrating the affected land are included in the information to c exhibition. This will help the community to better understand the equences of the proposal.	
Has community consultat	important that the r be placed on public changes and conse ation - s55(2)(e) tion been proposed? Yes Council has propos timeframe and meth	naps illustrating the affected land are included in the information to c exhibition. This will help the community to better understand the equences of the proposal. s sed a 14 day exhibition of the Planning Proposal. The proposed hod of exhibition is considered appropriate.	
Has community consultat Comment : Additional Director G	important that the r be placed on public changes and conse ation - s55(2)(e) tion been proposed? Yes Council has propos timeframe and meth General's requirement	maps illustrating the affected land are included in the information to c exhibition. This will help the community to better understand the equences of the proposal. s sed a 14 day exhibition of the Planning Proposal. The proposed hod of exhibition is considered appropriate. nts	
Has community consultat Comment : Additional Director G	important that the r be placed on public changes and conse ation - s55(2)(e) tion been proposed? Yes Council has propos timeframe and meth General's requirement	maps illustrating the affected land are included in the information to c exhibition. This will help the community to better understand the equences of the proposal. s sed a 14 day exhibition of the Planning Proposal. The proposed hod of exhibition is considered appropriate. nts	
Comment : Additional Director G Are there any additional I	important that the r be placed on public changes and conse ation - s55(2)(e) ation been proposed? Yes Council has propos timeframe and meth General's requirement Director General's requir	maps illustrating the affected land are included in the information to c exhibition. This will help the community to better understand the equences of the proposal. s sed a 14 day exhibition of the Planning Proposal. The proposed hod of exhibition is considered appropriate. nts	
Has community consultat Comment : Additional Director G Are there any additional I If Yes, reasons :	important that the r be placed on public changes and conse ation - s55(2)(e) tion been proposed? Yes Council has propos timeframe and meth General's requirement Director General's require the proposal	maps illustrating the affected land are included in the information to c exhibition. This will help the community to better understand the equences of the proposal. s sed a 14 day exhibition of the Planning Proposal. The proposed hod of exhibition is considered appropriate. nts rements? No	

3

Gunnedah LEP 1998 - Change in definition of flood prone land.

Proposal Assessment	
Principal LEP:	
Due Date : July 2012	
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	On 29 August 2011 a certificate permitting the exhibition of the Draft Gunnedah LEP 2011 was issued to Council. The Draft Gunnedah LEP includes a model local clause relating to "Flood Planning". It is anticipated that Council will commence exhibition of the Draft comprehensive LEP shortly. The definition contained in the Draft LEP is "flood planning level means the level of a 1:100ARI (average recurrent interval) flood event plus 0.5 metres freeboard."
	It is noted that Gunnedah Shire Council has also received LEP Acceleration Funding to help finalise its draft comprehensive LEP.
Assessment Criteria	
Need for planning proposal :	Council has identified the need for this Planning Proposal as an outcome of the completion of the Blackjack Creek Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan 2011 and recent legal advice that it has received.
	The completion of the flood study has provided Council with more accurate information on flood behaviour and potential impacts of floods within Gunnedah and they wish to use this information in conjunction with other available flood studies and flood data when implementing flood controls. Council has received independent legal advice about the status of the current flood prone land definition which urges them to update the definition within the Gunnedah LEP 1998. An extract from Council's legal advice states that:
	"We believe that it would be prudent if the gazettal of the new Gunnedah Local Environmental Plan is some time, to amend the flood prone land maps of the Gunnedah Local Environmental Plan 1998 to incorporate the new information. We suggest that an amendment be made to the Gunnedah LEP 1998 so as to make sure that the land identified in the new study is included in the definition of 'flood prone land' under the Gunnedah LEP 1998.
	Regardless of when the data is incorporated into the LEP it is essential that this be done as soon as possible, so that Council can obtain the protection of the indemnity provided under the Section 733 of the Local Government Act." (Mallik Rees Lawyers - April 2011)
	It is considered that this Planning Proposal is not essential as the provisions of the Draft comprehensive LEP will be matters for consideration when assessing development applications and will be referenced on planning certificates once it has commenced exhibition. Despite this, the Planning Proposal is supported given the legal advice Council has received, the intent of Council to utilise the most accurate and up to date information available when dealing with flood planning controls and in case progress in finalising the draft comprehensive LEP is delayed due to unforseen circumstances.

Gunnedah LEP 1998 - Change in definition of flood prone land.

Consistency with	There is no Regional Strategic Plan that applies to the Gunnedah Shire.
strategic planning framework :	The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with the Gunnedah Local
Inamework .	Environmental Study (Bridging Report) 2010 that was endorsed by the Director General's
	delegate in August 2010.
	The Planning Proposal is consistent with all SEPPs that apply to the Gunnedah Shire.
	Council identifies that s117 Directions 3.1 Residential Zones, 4.3 Flood Prone Land and 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements apply to this Planning Proposal. After further assessment it is considered that Directions 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones and 1.5 Rural Lands also apply to this Planning Proposal.
	The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with all the applicable s117 Directions except 4.3 Flood Prone Land.
	4.3 Flood Prone Land
	The Planning Proposal aims to amend the flooding provisions of the LEP by altering the definition of "flood prone land". The proposed alteration is considered not to be consistent with the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy and the Floodplain Development Manual (FDM) 2005 (including the Guideline on Development Controls on Low Flood Risk Areas). The inconsistency with this Direction is considered not to be of minor significance.
	The FDM 2005 defines flood prone land as "land susceptible to flooding by the PMF event.
	Flood prone land is synonymous with flood liable land". The current and proposed
	definitions of flood prone land in Gunnedah LEP 1998 are inconsistent with the FDM 2005
	as they apply only to land identified on the specified maps and includes land affected by
	the 1% Annual Exceedence Probability flood event rather than the PMF. To provide
	consistency with the definitions of the FDM 2005, the definition of "flood prone land"
	should be replaced in the Gunnedah LEP 1998 with the definition of "flood planning level".
	Flood planning levels relate to "flood planning areas" which more accurately represent the intent of the Planning Proposal to identify land to which development controls apply. A "flood planning area" is defined in the FDM 2005 as "the area of land below the FPL and
	thus subject to flood related development controls. The concept of flood planning area generally supersedes the flood liable concept in the 1986 manual".
	The Flood Prone Land Policy and FDM 2005 also state that "FPLs [flood planning levels]
	for typical residential development would generally be based around the 1% AEP [annual
	exceedence probability] flood event plus an appropriate freeboard (typically 0.5m)".
	Council's current and proposed definitions do not include a freeboard. Advice from the Floodplain Management Unit of the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) has been
	sought regarding the proposed change to the LEP. Verbal advice from OEH staff has
	confirmed that they support the use of the updated data for LEP matters but the flood planning level should include a 0.5m freeboard. It is therefore considered inappropriate
	for the proposal to proceed without including an appropriate freeboard in the flood
	planning level due to potential implications for public safety and property damage. The
	freeboard component of a flood planning level plays an important role as an additional
	buffer that may be required due to inaccuracies in flood modelling, wind and wave action
	of floodwaters and future developments that may have minor, but compounding, impacts
	upon flood levels. It is also considered to be inappropriate to establish an alternate flood planning level at the current time that does not include a 0.5m freeboard and is contrary to
	the new draft comprehensive LEP that will commence exhibition shortly.
	It is therefore recommended that if the proposal proceeds that the definition of "flood prone land" be replaced in the LEP with "flood planning level" and a 0.5m freeboard be
	included as follows:
	"flood planning level means the level of a 1:100ARI (average recurrent interval) flood event plus 0.5 metres freeboard."
	If the proposal is amended in this fashion, consistency with s117 Direction 4.3 Flood Prone

Gunnedah LEF	<mark>? 1998</mark> -	Change in	definition	of flood	prone land	Ι.
--------------	-----------------------	-----------	------------	----------	------------	----

Land will be achieved.

	Land will be achieved.		
	definition. It will howev and Plan - 1999 maps to allow the public to be a not be needed as it is u the large scale of the N this should not have an due to their scale. A co prone land permitted by	roach also removes the need to refer er require the Gunnedah-Carroll Floo o be updated to incoporate the 0.5m ccurately informed. Amendment to t inderstood that a 0.5m freeboard has amoi Valley Floodplain Atlas maps w by significant impact on the interpret insequential change to Clause 26 - Is by this Plan? of the Gunnedah LEP 19 rds of "flood prone land" with "land b	odplain Management Study freeboard prior to exhibition to he Blackjack Creek maps will a already been included, while vill not allow any change but ation of the maps by the public the development of flood 198 will also be needed to
Environmental social economic impacts :	economic impacts. It is will have no environme more land will be affect	hat the Planning Proposal will have in s considered that the changes to the ntal impact but may have a minor so and by flood planning controls than p n will affect a relatively small additio	definition of flood prone land ocial and economic impact as previously. It is understood that
Assessment Proces	S		
Proposal type :	Routine	Community Consultation Period :	14 Days
Timeframe to make LEP :	9 Month	Delegation :	DDG
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Office of Environment a	ind Heritage	
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No	
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes	
	This Planning Proposal	should proceed (with amendments	
If no, provide reasons :	in Council having flood	planning controls based on the late ir indemnity concerns relating to s73	
If no, provide reasons : Resubmission - s56(2)(b	in Council having flood will help to address the Act.		
	in Council having flood will help to address the Act.		
Resubmission - s56(2)(b	in Council having flood will help to address the Act. b) : No		
Resubmission - s56(2)(b If Yes, reasons :	in Council having flood will help to address the Act. b) : No tudies, if required. :		
Resubmission - s56(2)(b If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional st	in Council having flood will help to address the Act. b) : No tudies, if required. :		
Resubmission - s56(2)(b If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional st If Other, provide reasons	in Council having flood will help to address the Act. b) : No tudies, if required. : s : sultations, if required :		
Resubmission - s56(2)(b If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional st If Other, provide reasons Identify any internal cons No internal consultation	in Council having flood will help to address the Act. b) : No tudies, if required. : s : sultations, if required :	ir indemnity concerns relating to s73	
Resubmission - s56(2)(b If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional st If Other, provide reasons Identify any internal cons No internal consultation	in Council having flood will help to address the Act. b) : No tudies, if required. : s : sultations, if required : n required	ir indemnity concerns relating to s73	
Resubmission - s56(2)(b If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional st If Other, provide reasons Identify any internal cons No internal consultation Is the provision and fund	in Council having flood will help to address the Act. b) : No tudies, if required. : s : sultations, if required : n required	ir indemnity concerns relating to s73	
Resubmission - s56(2)(b If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional st If Other, provide reasons Identify any internal cons No internal consultation Is the provision and fund If Yes, reasons :	in Council having flood will help to address the Act. b) : No tudies, if required. : s : sultations, if required : n required	ir indemnity concerns relating to s73	33 of the Local Government

Gunnedah LEP 1998 - Change in definition of flood prone land.				
Planning_Proposal_15_	09_2011.pdf	Proposal		Yes
Planning Team Recomm	nendation			
Preparation of the planning	ng proposal supported a	it this stage : Recommended v	with Conditions	
S.117 directions:	3.1 Residential Zone 4.3 Flood Prone Land 6.1 Approval and Rei	d		
Additional Information :	It is recommended th	nat:		
	1. the Planning Prop	osal be supported;		
	"flood prone land" in	osal be amended prior to exh n the LEP with the definition o l as "the level of a 1:100ARI (a poard".	of "flood planning level	". Flood planning
		e consultation with the followi ent and Heritage on flooding i	-	
	 - 1980, the Gunneda Blackjack Creek Floo necessary in consult 	that supports the Planning P h – Carroll Floodplain Manag odplain Risk Management Stu tation with Office of Environm ropriate, and are placed on e	ement Study and Plan Idy and Plan – 2011) be nent and Heritage to inc	 1999 and the amended as corporate a 0.5m
	5. the Planning Prope days; and	osal be considered as 'low im	pact' and is exhibited	for a period of 14
	6. the Planning Prope	osal should be completed wit	hin 9 months.	
Supporting Reasons :		al will update the LEP flood of I relevant flood data and infor		
Signature:		D.		
Printed Name:	Craig Di	SS Date:	16/9/11	