

.

Heritage Amendment - Clarence Valley

Proposal Title :	Heritage Amendment - Clarence	e Valley	
Proposal Summary	in the heritage schedule of the	Council's LEP. These items we dy but were deferred during th	he original Heritage Amendment
PP Number :	PP_2011_CLARE_005_00	Dop File No :	11/17503
Proposal Details			
Date Planning Proposal Received :	26-Sep-2011	LGA covered :	Clarence Valley
Region :	Northern	RPA:	Clarence Valley Council
State Electorate :	CLARENCE	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Precinct		
Location Details			
Street :			
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :
	Itiple parcels of land as detailed in cument Tab	n the Summary of Deferred He	ritage Items, under the
DoP Planning Offi	cer Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Jenny Johnson	·*	
Contact Number :	0266416614		
Contact Email :	Jenny.Johnson@planning.nsw.g	jov.au	
RPA Contact Deta	ils		
Contact Name :	Deborah Wray		
Contact Number :	0266430271		
Contact Email :	deborah.wray@clarence.nsw.go	v.au	
DoP Project Mana	ger Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Jim Clark		
Contact Number :	0266416604		
Contact Email :	Jim.Clark@planning.nsw.gov.au		
Land Release Dat	a		
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Mid North Coast Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes

29 Sep 2011 03:25 pm

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 :	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes		
If No, comment :		ning Code of Practice in relation to n complied with to the best of the R	
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No		
If Yes, comment :		ot met any lobbyists in relation to th f any meeting between other depart al.	
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	Council is however cur was exhibited in early 2	is seeking to amend the heritage so rently finalising Clarence Valley dra 2010. Should the Clarence Valley Co of this planning proposal, the plann e new LEP.	ft Comprehensive LEP which mprehensive LEP be made
External Supporting Notes :			
equacy Assessment Statement of the ob Is a statement of the ok Comment :	jectives - s55(2)(a) bjectives provided? Yes	tended outcomes of the planning p	roposal are adequately expressed
	for the area by the p	roposed amendment. t Grafton's cultural heritage by inclu	uding additional heritage listings in
		le of the LEP. This will ensure appropriate appropriate the second s	
Explanation of prov	isions provided - s5	5(2)(b)	
Is an explanation of pro	ovisions provided? Yes		
Comment :	The planning proposition the objectives and in	sal provides a clear explanation of t ntended outcomes.	the intended provisions to achieve
		sal proposes to include 41 addition revious major heritage amendment	

Heritage Amendment - Clarence Valley

Justification - s55 (2)(c) a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes 2.3 Heritage Conservation 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? N/A The proposed heritage listings are the result of a four year heritage study for the Grafton e) List any other City area (the former City Council area). The Community based Heritage Study report matters that need to made recommendations of items and conservations groups that should be listed in be considered : Council's heritage schedule. Of these items 53 items were deferred based on submissions made during the exhibition process. This planning proposal discusses these 53 items for consideration of inclusion in Council heritage schedule. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? N/A The planning proposal is not inconsistent with any SEPP's or s117 Directions. If No, explain : The planning proposal is to amend the heritage schedule and does not involve any development on land within the mapped area. Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes The planning proposal does not specifically map all the individual items however the Comment : study area used for the Community based Heritage Study has been provided. If the planning proposal is to amend the new Clarence Valley LEP then maps to identify the items will need to be provided at a later stage. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes The Gateway will determine any time frame required for exhibition . Community Comment : consultation will be in accordance with the DoP&I's 'A Guide to preparing an LEP'. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? N/A If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment :

29 Sep 2011 03:25 pm

Heritage Amendment - Clarence Valley

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

	Due Date : November 20	011
	Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	The current principal LEP for the Clarence Valley (subject area) is the Grafton LEP 1988.
		The Clarence Valley draft Comprehensive LEP was exhibited in early 2010. The Department is currently considering the draft plan for making.
		Should the Clarence Valley comprehensive LEP be made prior to the finalisation of this planning proposal, the planning proposal will amend the heritage schedule and maps in the new comprehensive Clarence Valley LEP.
	Assessment Criteria	
	Need for planning proposal :	The proposed change to the LEP is the most appropriate means of achieving the desired outcomes for the proposal.
		Council's heritage strategy identified the conservation of cultural heritage as being important for future generations. It has also indicated there has been a loss of heritage value in the Grafton area over the years.
		The Government supports the protection of cultural heritage through its regional strategies and has provided funding to the Council to undertake the heritage study.
		Council has been concerned with the conflict which has arisen with the threat of removal or demolition of a heritage not listed when an application for redevelopment has been received.
		The planning proposal is required to allow the inclusion of deferred items from the original heritage amendment now that further community contact had been made.
	ж.	A number of owners of deferred items made objections during the initial exhibition period. The majority of objections were based on limited understanding of the implications to their properties. A number of property owners after discussion with Council staff now understand why their properties require listings, however a number of landowners may still hold reservation for their listings.
	Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The Heritage Study is consistent with Mid North Coast Regional Strategy relating to cultural heritage: "The Department of Planning and councils will review the scope and quality of the existing statutory lists of heritage items and ensure that all places of significance are included in the heritage schedules of local environmental plans".
		The planning proposal does not propose to change the zoning or intensify development on any land that is subject to this heritage amendment.
	Environmental social economic impacts :	No adverse environmental effects are likely to arise from the protection of cultural heritage. The protection of the nominated sites has the potential to enhance the environmental values of these sites.
		Council has identified property ownership as an important factor in society and that perceived limitations on the rights to develop are often resisted by owners.
		In order to minimise these perceived impacts Council undertook specific site assessment of each property with the property owners of the deferred items, to ensure that they were fully aware of what restrictions, if any, would be attached to their property and its heritage listing.
		The explanation and/or justification given to property owners seemed to alleviate most of the owners concerns and items requiring further protection were recommended for
-		

	inclusion on the	e heritage sche	edule or removed as not sign	ificant.	
	proposed for in properties that	clusion. The si Council did no	rred from the initial amendmo ite inspections undertaken by t require listing in the heritag the Council heritage schedu	y Council staff did le schedule. A tot	l highlight 12
	Council's consi satisfactory.	deration of the	issues including the views o	of affected landov	vners is
ssessment Proces	S				
Proposal type :	Consistent		Community Consultation Period :	14 Days	
Timeframe to make _EP :	9 Month		Delegation :	DDG	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)					
s Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No			
2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes			
f no, provide reasons :					
Resubmission - s56(2)(l	o) : No				
f Yes, reasons :			1		
dentify any additional s	tudies, if required.	:			
f Other, provide reason	s :				
The planning proposal completing this report			of Environment & Heritage (C been received.	DEH) for commen	t. At the time of
dentify any internal con	sultations, if requir	ed :			
No internal consultatio	n required				
s the provision and fund	ding of state infras	tructura rolovar	at to this plan? No		
	ung of state miras				
f Yes, reasons :					
uments					
Document File Name		141	DocumentType N	lame	Is Public
Covering Letter.pdf Planning Proposal.pdf Report on Deferred Iter			Proposal Coveri Proposal Study	ng Letter	Yes Yes Yes
Council Minutes.pdf			Study		Yes
nning Team Recom	mendation				1. 18 A
Preparation of the planr	ning proposal supp	orted at this sta	age : Recommended with Co	nditions	c

Additional Information :	It is recommended that:
	1. The planning proposal be supported;
	2. The planning proposal is to be exhibited for 28 days;
	3. The planning proposal be completed within 9 months.
	The planning proposal is consistent with S117 Direction 2.3 Heritage Conservation in that improved assessment of heritage aspects affecting certain properties has taken place.
O Berner Berner	
Supporting Reasons :	The conservation of cultural heritage is considered to be important for future generations, and Council believe the reason for the loss of heritage value in the Grafton area over the years can be attributed to the fact that too few items were currently listed.
Supporting Reasons ;	and Council believe the reason for the loss of heritage value in the Grafton area over the
Supporting Reasons :	years can be attributed to the fact that too few items were currently listed. This planning proposal will protect items through a comprehensive study as being of historical significance, having a high level of integrity or originality, being good example
	and Council believe the reason for the loss of heritage value in the Grafton area over the years can be attributed to the fact that too few items were currently listed. This planning proposal will protect items through a comprehensive study as being of historical significance, having a high level of integrity or originality, being good example
Supporting Reasons : Signature:	and Council believe the reason for the loss of heritage value in the Grafton area over the years can be attributed to the fact that too few items were currently listed. This planning proposal will protect items through a comprehensive study as being of historical significance, having a high level of integrity or originality, being good example