

Proposal Title :	Gunnedah LEP 2 Production, Kelv		ng of land from E3 Environ ngari Rd	nmental Manageme	nt to RU1 Primary	
Proposal Summ	Environmental M	To rezone various parcels of land in the Kelvin Rd and Rangari Rd area from E3 Environmental Management to RU1 Primary Production to better reflect the site characteristics of the land and to permit intensive livestock agriculture.				
PP Number :	PP_2015_GUNNE	E_006_00	Dop File No :	15/16572		
oposal Details	3					
Date Planning Proposal Recei	12-Nov-2015 ved :		LGA covered :	Gunnedah		
Region :	Northern		RPA :	Gunnedah S	ihire Council	
State Electorate	E TAMWORTH		Section of the Act :	55 - Planning	g Proposal	
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning					
ocation Detail	S					
Street :	'Glenbrae' 3935 Longa	rm Road				
Suburb :	Rangari	City :	via Gunnedah	Postcode :	2380	
Land Parcel :	Lot 1 DP 825588 and Lo	ot 1 DP 11498	70			
Street :	'Fourways' 4000 Kelvir	Road				
Suburb :	Rangari	City :	via Gunnedah	Postcode :	2380	
Land Parcel :	Part of Lot 2 DP 178083	3				
Street :	'The Meadows' 2670 Ra	'The Meadows' 2670 Rangari Road				
Suburb :	Rangari	City :	via Gunnedah	Postcode :	2380	
Land Parcel :	Lot 87 DP 754946, Lot '	Lot 87 DP 754946, Lot 19 DP 114885 and Lot 5 DP 1172836				
Street :	Kelvin Road					
Suburb :	Rangari	City :	via Gunnedah	Postcode :	2380	
Land Parcel :	Part of Lots 96, 97 and 98 DP 754955 and Lot 2 DP 1172836					
Street :	'Rangari' 3103 Rangari Road					
Suburb :	Rangari	City :	via Gunnedah	Postcode :	2380	
Land Parcel :	Part of Lots 9 and 11 D	P 114885, pai	rt of Lot 1 DP 1089276, pa	rt of Lot 18 DP 1148	385 and part of	
Street :	Lot 1 DP 190411 Rangari Road					
Suburb :	Rangari	City :	via Gunnedah	Postcode :	2380	
Land Parcel :	Lot 99 DP 1140224					

Primary Production, Kelvin Rd and Rangari Rd					
Street : Kelv	in Road				
Suburb : Rang	gari	City :	via Gunnedah	Postcode :	2380
Land Parcel : Lots	7001 and 7002 DP 1073	061			
DoP Planning Office	er Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Jon Stone				
Contact Number :	0267019688				
Contact Email :	jon.stone@planning.nsv	v.gov.au			
RPA Contact Detail	S				
Contact Name :	Brendan Williams				
Contact Number :	0267402144				
Contact Email :	brendanwilliams@infog	unnedah.c	om.au		
DoP Project Manag	er Contact Details				
Contact Name :					
Contact Number :					
Contact Email :					
Land Release Data					
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 :	No, comment : The Department of Planning and Environment's Code of Practice in relation to communications and meetings with lobbyists has been complied with to the best of the Region's knowledge. The Northern Region has not met with any lobbyists in relation to this proposal, nor has the Northern Region been advised of any meeting between other Departmental Officers and lobbyists concerning the proposal.				
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists?	No				
If Yes, comment :					
Supporting notes					
Internal Supporting Notes :					

External Supporting Notes :

Adequacy Assessment

Statement of the objectives - s55(2)(a)

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment : The objectives and intended outcomes of the Planning Proposal are adequately expressed for the proposed amendment to Gunnedah LEP 2012.

Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b)

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment : The Planning Proposal provides a clear explanation of the intended provisions to achieve the objectives and intended outcomes.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

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

b)	S.117	directions	identified	bv RPA :
----	-------	------------	------------	----------

* May need the Director General's agreement

- 1.2 Rural Zones 1.5 Rural Lands
- 2.1 Environment Protection Zones
- 2.3 Heritage Conservation
- 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates
- 3.3 Home Occupations
- 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
- 3.6 Shooting Ranges

Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes

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

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?

SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008

e) List any other The New England North West Strategic Regional Land Use Plan applies to the 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? Yes Comment : Maps have been provided with the Planning Proposal. They show the current land zoning and proposed land zoning for the site. It is considered that these maps are adequate for community consultation. Council has advised that while the mapping shows the correct land, that the proposal does contain errors within the written property description list. It is recommended that prior to community consultation that the proposal be amended to update the property description list to better inform the public. Maps in accordance with the Department's technical mapping standards will need to be prepared before a Parliamentary Counsel's opinion can be sought.

Has community consult	ation been proposed? Yes	
Comment : The relevant planning authority has identified a 14 day exhibition period for the proposal. As the proposal will permit a number of additional uses on the land (intensive livestock agriculture) and is not consistent with Council's Department strategy which identifies the land for environmental protection zoning (refer to discussion below), a 28 exhibition period is recommended.		
Additional Director	General's requirements	
Are there any additional	Director General's requirements? Yes	
If Yes, reasons :		
Overall adequacy of	the proposal	
Does the proposal meet	t the adequacy criteria? Yes	
If No, comment : roposal Assessment Principal LEP:	 The Planning Proposal and accompanying documentation are considered to satisfy the adequacy criteria by: Providing appropriate objectives and intended outcomes; Providing a suitable explanation of the provisions proposed by the LEP to achieve the outcomes; Providing an adequate justification for the proposal; Outlining a proposed community consultation program; and Providing a nuthorisation to exercise its plan making delegations. As the Planning Proposal deals with matters of only local significance, it is considered appropriate that an authorisation to exercise its plan making delegations be issued to Council, if the Planning Proposal is supported. Council has provided a project time line which estimates that the LEP will be ready for notification in March 2016. To ensure an adequate period to complete the proposal, a 6 month time frame is recommended. 	
Due Date : Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	Gunnedah LEP 2012 was made on 29 June 2012.	
Assessment Criteria		
Need for planning proposal :	The Planning Proposal is not the result of any strategic study or report. The proposal is the result of Council receiving a request to rezone Lot 1 DP 825588, 'Glenbrae', 3935 Longarm Road, Gunnedah from E3 Environmental Management to RU1 Primary Production to permit intensive livestock agriculture on the land. Intensive livestock agriculture is not a permissible land use within the current E3 Environmental Management Zone applying to the site.	
	An investigation of the land has identified that it does not contain any known areas of special ecological, scientific, cultural or aesthetic value that warrant retention of the current E3 Environmental Management Zone. This investigation also considered some	

Frimary Production, R	ervin Ru and Rangan Ru				
	the final Planning Proposal.	e to its similar form and charact Council has advised that all lar en notified of the proposed rezo	d owners of the additional		
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with the New England North West Strategic Regional Land Use Plan. The land is not identified as biophyiscal strategic agricultural land.				
	The Gunnedah Rural Land Use Strategy 2007 and its Addendum were approved by Director General in 2009 and established the criteria for zoning land for environmental management purposes. The primary purpose was to protect the integrity, natural values and features of the rural landscape by zoning land above the 450m contour line to E3 Environmental Management Zone under Gunnedah LEP 2012. Upon further investigation, the adoption of this contour line has proven not to be reflective of the nature or site characteristics of some of the land. It is therefore considered that although this proposal is inconsistent with the methodology adopted to identify E3 zoned land, the proposed rezoning is of minor significance.				
	Despite the Planning Proposal identifying a number of potential inconsistencies with various SEPPs and s117 Directions, the proposal is considered to be consistent with all applicable SEPPs and s117 Directions apart from Direction 2.1 Environmental Protection Zones.				
	protection standards that ap Management Zone. It is cons has historically been used fo	consistent with this Direction as oply to the land by removing the sidered this inconsistency is of or extensive agriculture, has be rbitrarily and did not reflect any	e current E3 Environmental minor significance as the land en extensively cleared and as		
Environmental social economic impacts :	The subject land has been used for extensive agricultural purposes for many years (primarily cattle and sheep grazing). There is no significant vegetation on the site other than some planted tree corridors (windbreaks) and a stand of vegetation on part of Lot 87. As extensive agriculture is currently being undertaken across the land, and is permitted without consent under Gunnedah LEP 2012 in the E3 Zone, the proposed zone change is considered unlikely to have any adverse implications to the current status quo. Should any intensification of agricultural land use be proposed on the land that may impact on local flora or fauna (including koalas), it is considered that this can be adequately addressed in more detail at the development application stage should the rezoning proceed and subject to consultation with the Office of Environment and Heritage.				
	No significant adverse socia identified.	Il or economic impacts associat	ted with the proposal have been		
Assessment Process	5				
Proposal type :	Routine	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days		
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 months	Delegation :	RPA		
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :	Office of Environment and H	leritage			

		ari Rd		
s Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No		
2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes		
f no, provide reasons :	Council has identifie	d consultation w	ith the Office of Environment and He	eritage.
	The proposed agenc	y consultation is	considered to be appropriate and is	supported.
Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No			
f Yes, reasons :				
dentify any additional st	udies, if required. :			
f Other, provide reasons	4			
dentify any internal cons	ultations, if required :			
lo internal consultation	required			
s the provision and fund	ing of state infrastructu	re relevant to this	nlan? No	
If Yes, reasons :		a o roiovant to una		
uments				
Document File Name			DocumentType Name	Is Public
Cover Letter.pdf			Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Planning Proposal.pdf			Proposal	Yes
Council Report.pdf Supporting information	from Stewart Surveys	ndf	Proposal Proposal	Yes Yes
2015-11-23 - Planning T	•		Determination Document	No
ning Team Recom	nendation			
Preparation of the planning	ng proposal supported	at this stage : Re	commended with Conditions	
S.117 directions:	1.2 Rural Zones			
	1.5 Rural Lands			
	2.1 Environment Pr			
	2.3 Heritage Conse 3.2 Caravan Parks a		d Home Estates	
	3.3 Home Occupation		a nome Latates	
	6.3 Site Specific Pre	ovisions		
	3.6 Shooting Range	s		
Additional Information :	It is recommended	that:		
	1. The Planning Pro	posal be suppor	ted;	
	2. The Planning Pro	-	-	
	_	-	ted within 6 months;	add7 Direction 2 d
			ermines that the inconsistency with ustified as a matter of minor signific	
			vironment and Heritage be undertak	
			he proposal be amended to include	
	written property des			1
			ouncil to exercise its plan making de	legations be
	granted for this mat	Lei.		
Supporting Reasons	This proposal is an	norted as it will	rezone land to better reflect its histo	rical use and

land characteristics.

	N		
Signature:	la		
Printed Name:	Craig Diss Date: _	24/11/15	