

Planning

Planning Team Report

Proposal Title :	Port Macquarie Hastings LEP 2011	Amendment No 26 - Ad	vertising on Bus Shelters	
Proposal Summary :	Amend Port Macquarie Hastings LEP 2011 - Schedule 2 Exempt Development Signage, advertising structures and displays - to permit certain signage on bus shelters.			
PP Number :	PP_2013_PORTM_005_00	Dop File No :	13/07150	
oposal Details	an names of the state of the state of the	hitte kan note a state t	(and the set of the se	
Date Planning Proposal Received :	23-Apr-2013	LGA covered :	Port Macquarie-Hastings	
Region :	Northern	RPA:	Port Macquarie-Hastings Counci	
State Electorate :	PORT MACQUARIE	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal	
LEP Type :	Policy	2		
ocation Details				
Street :		2		
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :	
Land Parcel : Co	ouncil road reserves within the Port M	acquarie Hastings local	government area	
DoP Planning Off	icer Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Denise Wright			
Contact Number :	0266416603		the second state of the second se	
Contact Email :	denise.wright@planning.nsw.gov.a			
RPA Contact Deta	ils			
Contact Name :	Leanne Fuller			
Contact Number :	0265818674		•	
Contact Email :	leanne.fuller@pmhc.nsw.gov.au		· ·	
DoP Project Mana	iger Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Jim Clark	÷		
Contact Number :	0266416604			
Contact Email :	jim.clark@planning.nsw.gov.au			
Land Release Dat			• *	
		Dalassa Ant. M	x	
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :		
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Mid North Coast Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy	Yes	

MDP Number :		Date of Release :		
Area of Release (Ha) :		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 :	Ô	
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been	Yes			
complied with :				
If No, comment :	The Department of Planning and Infrastructure Code of Practice in relation to communication and meetings with Lobbyists has been complied with to the best of the Region's knowledge.			
Have there been	No			
meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :				
If Yes, comment :	Northern Region has not met any lobbyists in relation to this proposal, nor has Northern Region been advised of any meeting between other departmental officers and lobbyists concerning this proposal.			
upporting notes				
	3			
Notes : External Supporting	from the necessity to be rela	d Schedule 2 of the LEP to exc ted to development on the lan are also proposed to address r on the shelter.	d on which the shelter is	
Notes : External Supporting Notes :	from the necessity to be rela located. Additional criteria a restrict the number of signs	ted to development on the lan are also proposed to address r	d on which the shelter is	
Notes : External Supporting Notes : equacy Assessmen	from the necessity to be rela located. Additional criteria a restrict the number of signs t	ted to development on the lan are also proposed to address r	d on which the shelter is	
Notes : External Supporting Notes : equacy Assessmen	from the necessity to be rela located. Additional criteria a restrict the number of signs	ted to development on the lan are also proposed to address r	d on which the shelter is	
	from the necessity to be rela located. Additional criteria a restrict the number of signs t	ted to development on the lan are also proposed to address r	d on which the shelter is	
Notes : External Supporting Notes : equacy Assessmen tatement of the ob	from the necessity to be rela located. Additional criteria a restrict the number of signs t jectives - s55(2)(a) jectives provided? Yes The objectives and interd	ted to development on the lan are also proposed to address r on the shelter.	d on which the shelter is oad safety requirements and 	
Notes : External Supporting Notes : equacy Assessmen tatement of the ob Is a statement of the ob Comment :	from the necessity to be rela located. Additional criteria a restrict the number of signs t jectives - s55(2)(a) jectives provided? Yes The objectives and interd	ited to development on the lan are also proposed to address r on the shelter. Ned outcomes of the planning p ment to the Port Macquarie LEF	d on which the shelter is oad safety requirements and 	
Notes : External Supporting Notes : equacy Assessmen tatement of the ob Is a statement of the ob Comment : Explanation of prov	from the necessity to be rela located. Additional criteria a restrict the number of signs t jectives - s55(2)(a) jectives provided? Yes The objectives and intend for the proposed amendm isions provided - s55(2)(ited to development on the lan are also proposed to address r on the shelter. Ned outcomes of the planning p ment to the Port Macquarie LEF	d on which the shelter is oad safety requirements and 	
Notes : External Supporting Notes : equacy Assessmen tatement of the ob Is a statement of the ob Comment :	from the necessity to be related to be relat	ited to development on the lan are also proposed to address r on the shelter. led outcomes of the planning p nent to the Port Macquarie LEF b) ovides a clear explanation of t	d on which the shelter is oad safety requirements and 	
Notes : External Supporting Notes : equacy Assessmen tatement of the ob Is a statement of the ob Comment : Explanation of prov Is an explanation of prov	from the necessity to be related to the number of signs are strict the objectives and intend for the proposed amendment are states are strict are strictly are strict	ted to development on the lan are also proposed to address r on the shelter.	d on which the shelter is oad safety requirements and proposal are adequately expressed 2 2011. he intended provisions to acjieve re)2007 identifies certain ent may be carried out without the ince or repair of bus shelters for or nt but commercial advertising is ntains a list of additional "Exempt of require development approval. ad 'displays' are included, however	

Port Macquarie Hastings LEP 2011 Amendment No 26 - Advertising on Bus Shelters

Additional criteria are also proposed to address road safety requirements and restrict the number of signs on the shelter.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

* May need the Director General's agreement

Is the Director General's agreement required? No

c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?

SEPP No 64—Advertising and Signage SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007

e) List any other matters that need to be considered :

Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes

If No, explain :

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? No

Comment: .

The proposal is not site specific, applying to the Port Macquarie Hastings LGA. Mapping is not required

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :

Council suggests a 14 day consultation period is adequate. The proposal is considered to be a minor matter which is not inconsistent with the regional planning framework, presents no issues with regard to infrastructure provision, is not a principal LEP and does not reclassify public land. This view is supported.

Additional Director General's requirements

Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No

If Yes, reasons :

Overall adequacy of the proposal

Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes

If No, comment :

The planning proposal satisfies the adequacy criteria by:

- 1. Providing appropriate objectives and intended outcomes.
- 2. Providing a suitable explanation of the provisions proposed by the planning proposal to achieve the outcomes.
- 3. Providing an adequate justification for the proposal.
- 4. Providing a timeline which suggests completion of the proposal within 6 months.
- 5. Providing evaluation criteria for delegation to be issued to the Council to make the plan. The proposal is appropriate for delegation.

Port Macquarie Hastings LEP 2011 Amendment No 26 - Advertising on Bus Shelters

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Port Macquarie Hastings LEP was published 23 February 2011. The planning proposal is an Comments in relation amendment to the LEP.

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :

to Principal LEP :

The planning proposal has not been initiated as the result of any strategic strategy or report. Rather it is in response to enquiries to Council in relation to bus shelters and associated signage for Wauchope, similar to that found in Port Macquarie.

The proposed amendment to the LEP is the only means of achieving the desired outcome to allow signage (with advertising content not related to the site) on bus shelters in the Port Macquarie Hastings LGA, as exempt development.

Consistency with strategic planning framework :

The proposal is considered to be consistent with all applicable S117 Directions, SEPPs and regional strategies.

State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPP).

Council has addressed the provisions of SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes)2008, SEPP 64 (Advertising and Signage) and SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007. While these SEPPs contain related provisions, the exempt signage provisions proposed for Schedule 2 of the Port Macquarie Hastings LEP will not be inconsistent with any of the SEPPs.

Schedule 2 Exempt development contains additional exempt development not specified in the Codes SEPP. The provisions for Signage, advertising structures and displays in Schedule 2 are proposed to be amended to enable certain signage in Council bus shelters, to display advertising content unrelated to the particular site. Additional provisions are also proposed to address road safety issues.

Council considers that the planning proposal will also address the zone related prohibition for display of bus shelter signage under SEPP 64 by the amendment to Schedule 2 of the LEP. Council's interpretation of this SEPP is in error. Although clause 6(2) of SEPP 64 provides that the Policy does not apply to exempt development, clause 10 of the SEPP over-rides these provisions to prohibit display of an advertisement within many areas, such as single-dwelling residential, environmental or open space zones and heritage areas. This issue has been discussed with Council. However the proposed amendment to Schedule 2 of the LEP is not inconsistent with SEPP 64 and can proceed.

Environmental social economic impacts :

Council considers that no significant environmental, social or economic impacts are raised by the planning proposal. Bus shelters are small scale low impact development, usually within road reserves, unlikely to result in adverse environmental impact. As noted above additional provisions are proposed to address road safety requirements."

Council's consideration of the proposal and conclusions are considered reasonable.

ssessment Proce	SS		125	
Proposal type :	Minor	Community Consultation Period :	14 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 Month	Delegation	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Transport for NSW - Roads and	Maritime Services		
5.005				<i>.</i> #
Is Public Hearing by th	ne PAC required? No			
(2)(a) Should the matt	rer proceed ? Yes			
lf no, provide reasons	:			
Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No		1 2	
If Yes, reasons :	<u> </u>			
Identify any additional	studies, if required. :			
Identify any internal co	onsultations, if required :			
Identify any internal co No internal consultat Is the provision and fu	onsultations, if required :	to this plan? No		
Identify any internal co No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons :	onsultations, if required : tion required	to this plan? No	• •	
Identify any internal co No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons : cuments	onsultations, if required : tion required	to this plan? No	ame	Is Public
No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name	onsultations, if required : tion required			Is Public Yes
Identify any internal co No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name Port Macquarie Hasti Bus Shelter Signage	onsultations, if required : tion required unding of state infrastructure relevant	DocumentType N		
Identify any internal co No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name Port Macquarie Hasti Bus Shelter Signage Planning Proposal Ad	ings LEP 2011 Amendment No 26 Covering Letter.pdf dvertising on Bus Shelters.pdf	DocumentType N Proposal Coverin		Yes
Identify any internal co No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name Port Macquarie Hasti Bus Shelter Signage Planning Proposal Ac nning Team Record	ings LEP 2011 Amendment No 26 Covering Letter.pdf dvertising on Bus Shelters.pdf	DocumentType N Proposal Coverin Proposal	ng Letter	Yes
Identify any internal co No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons : Cuments Document File Name Port Macquarie Hasti Bus Shelter Signage Planning Proposal Action Inning Team Recou	ings LEP 2011 Amendment No 26 Covering Letter.pdf dvertising on Bus Shelters.pdf	DocumentType N Proposal Coverin Proposal	ng Letter	Yes
Identify any internal co No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons : Cuments Document File Name Port Macquarie Hasti Bus Shelter Signage Planning Proposal Action Inning Team Recon Preparation of the plan S.117 directions:	ings LEP 2011 Amendment No 26 Covering Letter.pdf dvertising on Bus Shelters.pdf	DocumentType N Proposal Coverin Proposal	ng Letter	Yes
Identify any internal co No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons : Cuments Document File Name Port Macquarie Hasti Bus Shelter Signage Planning Proposal Ac nning Team Recou Preparation of the plan S.117 directions:	ings LEP 2011 Amendment No 26 Covering Letter.pdf dvertising on Bus Shelters.pdf	DocumentType N Proposal Coverin Proposal	ng Letter	Yes
Identify any internal co No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons : Cuments Document File Name Port Macquarie Hasti Bus Shelter Signage Planning Proposal Ad nning Team Record	ings LEP 2011 Amendment No 26 Covering Letter.pdf dvertising on Bus Shelters.pdf mmendation nning proposal supported at this state to the instant of the ins	DocumentType N Proposal Coverin Proposal ge : Recommended with Con	ng Letter	Yes

Supporting Reasons :	5. Delegation to finalise the planning proposal be issued to the Council. The reasons for conditions to the Gateway Determination is to expedite the completion of the planning proposal that involves a matter of minor significance. The planning proposal is not inconsistent with all relevant local and regional planning strategies, section 117 directions and SEPPs.			
Signature:	- J.L.			
Printed Name:	JIM CLAUZK Date: 26	April 2013		
		بتحديده والمائنا منتج		
		8		
5				
	a			
3				
	æ			
	*			