

Planning Team Report

Kempsey LEP 2013 Amendment No 4 - Dual Occupancy (detached) and secondary dwellings in the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 Zones Kempsey LEP 2013 Amendment No 4 - Dual Occupancy (detached) and secondary dwellings in Proposal Title : the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 Zones This Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Kempsey LEP 2013 to permit with consent dual Proposal Summary : occupancy (detached) and secondary dwellings in the RU1 Primary Production, RU2 Rural Landscape, RU4 Primary Production Small Lots and R5 Large Lot Residential zones and apply development controls relating to their location. PP Number : PP_2015_KEMPS_003_00 Dop File No : 15/11731 **Proposal Details** LGA covered : Kempsey Date Planning 31-Aug-2015 Proposal Received RPA: **Kempsey Shire Council** Northern Region : Section of the Act : OXLEY 55 - Planning Proposal State Electorate : LEP Type : Policy **Location Details** Street : Postcode : Suburb : City: All land zoned RU1 Primary Production, RU2 Rural Landscape, RU4 Primary Production Small Land Parcel : Lots and R5 Large Lot Residential **DoP Planning Officer Contact Details** Contact Name : **Jon Stone** 0267019688 Contact Number : Contact Email : jon.stone@planning.nsw.gov.au **RPA Contact Details** Contact Name : Georgia Rayner Contact Number : 0265663200 Contact Email : geoargia.rayner@kempsey.nsw.gov.au **DoP Project Manager Contact Details Jim Clark** Contact Name : Contact Number : 0266416604 Contact Email : jim.clark@planning.nsw.gov.au Land Release Data Release Area Name : Growth Centre : Consistent with Strategy : Regional / Sub **Regional Strategy:**

MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	
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 :	-	ng and Environment's Code of Pra tings with lobbyists has been con	
Have there been	-		
meetings or communications with	No		
registered lobbyists? : If Yes, comment :		e has not met any lobbyists in rela of any meeting between other offic proposal.	
upporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :			
External Supporting Notes :		esire within the community to allo erty in rural areas within the LGA.	
		e of income to subsidise agricultu ond dwelling. This also provides a	
	-	sion transfer to younger generation	ons by allowing two
	both generations to take a	tely but on the same property. Thi dvantage of the financial, social a	
		nise unapproved dwellings and st Section 94 contributions apply to ngs';	
	- Increase in the population stores, community groups	n of rural areas therefore providin	
	-	or potential future use of the land	· · · ·
	State Environmental Plann secondary dwellings in the	ning Policy (Affordable Rental Hou e R5 zone with consent.	ising) 2009 currently permits
equacy Assessmen	ıt	A State of the second second	And the second second
tatement of the ob	jectives - s55(2)(a)		
Is a statement of the ob	jectives provided? Yes		

within the RU1 Primary Production, RU2 Rural Landscape and RU4 Primary Production Small Lots and R5 Large Lot Residential zones within the Kempsey Shire Local Government Area (LGA); and - To adopt development control provisions within the KLEP 2013 relating to dual occupancy (detached) and secondary dwellings in the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 zones.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The explanation of the provisions adequately describes the intention the Planning Proposal.

An minor error in the planning proposal will require correcting prior to community consultation. A suggested local clause is included in the proposal but is not clear whether it applies to land zoned R5. Council staff have verbally advised the clause is intended to apply to the R5 zone. It will be recommended that that proposal be amended to remove the proposed clause and replace it with a plain english explanation of the development controls and where they are to apply.

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

1.2 Rural Zones
 1.5 Rural Lands
 2.2 Coastal Protection
 2.3 Heritage Conservation
 3.1 Residential Zones
 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
 4.3 Flood Prone Land
 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies

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 14—Coastal Wetlands SEPP No 21—Caravan Parks SEPP No 26—Littoral Rainforests SEPP No 33—Hazardous and Offensive Development **SEPP No 36—Manufactured Home Estates** SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP No 62—Sustainable Aquaculture SEPP No 64—Advertising and Signage SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development SEPP No 71—Coastal Protection SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Major Projects) 2005 SEPP (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007 SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009

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

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

See the 'Assessment' section of this planning team report.

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? No

Comment :

If No, explain :

This Planning Proposal does not seek to amend any Maps of the Kempsey LEP 2013.

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :

The Planning Proposal does not indicate or specify a timeframe for community consultation. The project timeline indicates a month has been allowed for public exhibition and government agency consultation. Given the nature of the proposal and the wide area the proposed changes affects, a 28 day public exhibition period is considered appropriate.

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 generally 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 (noting the change required prior to community consultation);

- 3. Providing an adequate justification for the proposal;
- 4. Providing for community consultation; and
- 5. Providing a project timeframe which suggests completion within 9 months.

Timeline

- The Planning Proposal includes a project timeline which estimates the completion of the Planning Proposal by June 2016 (9 months). It is considered that this 9 month time frame would be appropriate. This does not restrict Council from finalising the LEP amendment sooner.

Delegation.

- Council has confirmed via email that it does seek Plan Making Functions for this LEP Amendment. It is considered that these functions should be delegated to Council given that the proposal is consistent with the Regional and Local Growth Strategies.

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Comments in relation to Principal LEP :

The Kempsey LEP 2013 is a Principal LEP and came into effect on 20 December 2013. The Planning Proposal seeks to amend this planning instrument.

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :

Council has identified that the permitted residential types within the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 zones do not completely meet the needs of the community. Council, through its implementation of the Kempsey LEP 2013, has identified a desire within the community to allow the construction of a second dwelling on a single property in rural areas and the R5 zones within the LGA. Council is seeking to achieve this by having detached dual occupancy's and secondary dwellings (as defined by the Kemspey LEP 2013) permitted with consent in the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 zones.

Reasons for the need for additional dwellings in these zones include:

- To facilitate farm succession transfer to younger generations by allowing two generations to live separately but on the same property. This creates the opportunity for both generations to take advantage of the financial, social and economic benefits of this arrangement;

- Increase in the population of rural areas therefore providing support for local schools, stores, community groups;

- Reducing the demand for the subdivision of large parcels of rural land, thus maintaining continued agricultural use or potential future use of the land;

- To allow a second source of income to subsidise agricultural activities for the property owners by renting the second dwelling. This also provides additional rental housing stock to the market; and

- The opportunity to legitimise unapproved dwellings and structures and levy Section 94 contributions for these as Section 94 contributions apply to detached dual occupancies but not 'secondary dwellings'.

Council is therefore seeking to provide additional housing choice within the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 zones by permitting with consent detached dual occupancies and secondary dwellings.

Attached dual occupancies are currently permitted with consent in the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 zones.

Council is also seeking to include an additional local clause in the LEP to provide development controls on the location of detached dual occupancies and secondary dwellings. The controls they seek include that:

the development will not impair the use of the land for agriculture or rural industries;
the principal dwelling and the detached dual occupancy or secondary dwelling will use the same vehicular access to and from a public road;

- the principal dwelling and the detached dual occupancy or secondary dwelling will be situated within 100 metres of each other;

- the land is physically suitable for the development;

- the land is capable of accommodating the on-site disposal and management of sewage for the development; and

- the development will not have an adverse impact on the scenic amenity or character of the rural environment.

The 100m location requirement aims to ensure that dwellings are clustered therefore minimising the likelihood of land use conflicts and reducing environmental impacts, including impacts to the rural landscape and character. The 100m distance also aims to allow for potential topographical limitations of the natural landscape as well as providing sufficient distance for privacy between the two dwellings.

Council does not propose to amend the subdivision controls within the LEP.

Consistency with strategic planning framework : The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy.

The amendments proposed in this planning proposal will assist in the provision of dwellings to meet projected housing demands. The proposal has the potential to provide diversity in the choice of housing as well as adding to the amount of rental stock in the LGA. The Mid North Coast Regional Strategy also acknowledges that agriculture forms an important part of the Mid North Coast's economic and social base. It recognises that future population growth is likely to put pressure on farmland resources and that it is important to find a balance between protecting high value agricultural land and providing opportunities for rural lifestyle, settlement and housing. This Planning Proposal is considered to provide an opportunity to achieve this.

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with all relevant SEPPs, including the Rural Planning Principles of the SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008 and therefore the S117 Direction 1.5 Rural Land. The Proposal is also considered to be consistent with Direction 1.2 Rural Zones (4(b)) because attached dual occupancies are currently permissible with consent in the subject zones and, as a result, there would not be a net increase in potential dwellings.

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with all applicable section 117 Directions, except in relation to Directions 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils, 4.3 Flood Prone Land and 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection as discussed below:

4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils

This Direction is relevant to the proposal. The direction provides that a planning proposal must not propose an intensification of land uses on land containing acid sulfate soils. There are areas of land within the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 zones in the Kempsey LGA that are affected by acid sulphate soils. As attached dual occupancy development is already permitted in these areas, this Planning Proposal would not result in an intensification of land use permitted in the areas affected. Provisions exist within Kempsey LEP 2013 to address the potential impact on acid sulfate soils at development application stage. It is therefore considered that the inconsistency of the proposal with the direction is of minor significance and has been justified in accordance with the terms of the direction.

4.3 Flood Prone Land

This Direction is relevant as the Planning Proposal will affect land that is flood prone. The proposal will result in the potential for detached dual occupancies or secondary dwellings to be affected by flooding, however as attached dual occupancy development is already permitted in these zones, this Planning Proposal would not result in a net intensification of dwellings nor a net increase in demand for rescue services in times of flood in the areas affected. Council's LEP has controls relating to flood prone land. It is therefore considered that the inconsistency of the proposal with the direction is of minor significance and has been justified in accordance with the terms of the direction.

4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection

This Direction is relevant as the Planning Proposal will affect land that is identified as bushfire prone land. The Direction requires the RPA to consult with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service after a Gateway Determination has been issued. Until this consultation has occurred the consistency of the proposal with the Direction remains unresolved.

Environmental social economic impacts : There is the potential that permitting dual occupancy (detached) or secondary dwellings in rural zones may impact adversely on critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats. However, this is considered unlikely given any future proposed development would be subject to the development application process and any environmental impacts could be appropriately managed and minimised through the proposed development controls.

It is considered that this planning proposal will have a positive social and economic impact as it will facilitate farm succession planning and the easier transfer of rural

Kempsey LEP 2013 Amendment No 4 - Dual Occupancy (detached) and secondary	
dwellings in the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 Zones	

	same property. I	t will also pot ural activities	ns by allowing two generatio entially provide a second sou by renting the second dwellin k to the market	urce of income to	subsidise
Assessment Proces	SS				
Proposal type :	Routine		Community Consultation Period :	28 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	9 months		Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) :	NSW Rural Fire S	\$ervice			
Is Public Hearing by th	ne PAC required?	No			
(2)(a) Should the matte	er proceed ?	Yes			
If no, provide reasons	:				
Resubmission - s56(2))(b) : No				
If Yes, reasons :					
Identify any additional	studies, if required. :				
If Other, provide reaso	ons :			ø	
Identify any internal co	onsultations, if require	ed :			
No internal consultati	ion required				
Is the provision and fu	nding of state infrastr	ucture relevan	t to this plan? No		
If Yes, reasons :					
cuments	5.2 1.1.5.1	-3.11			
Document File Name			DocumentType N	ame	Is Public
anning Team Recor					
Preparation of the plar	nning proposal suppo	rted at this sta	ge : Recommended with Cor	ditions	
S.117 directions:	1.2 Rural Zones 1.5 Rural Lands 2.2 Coastal Pro 2.3 Heritage Co	s otection onservation			
	3.1 Residential				
	4.1 Acid Sulfate 4.3 Flood Prone				
	4.4 Planning fo		otection		
	5.1 Implementa				

Additional Information :	It is recommended that:
	1. The Planning Proposal be supported;
	2. The Planning Proposal be exhibited for 28 days;
	3. The Planning Proposal be completed within 9 months;
	4. That the RPA consult with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service in
	accordance with the requirements of S117 Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection;
	5. The potential unresolved inconsistency with s117 Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire
	Protection be noted; 6. That an authorisation to exercise delegation be issued to Council;
	7. That the Secretary's delegate determine that the inconsistencies with s117 Directions
	4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils and 4.3 Flood Prone Land are justified as the matters are of minor
	significance;
	8. That prior to community consultation the Planning Proposal be amended to replace the proposed clause with a plain english explanation of the proposed development controls
	and where they are to apply.
Supporting Reasons :	and where they are to apply. The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Kempsey LEP 2013 for the purpose of permitting detached dual occupancies and secondary dwellings in the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 Zones as well as providing development controls via a local clause in the LEP. This will help address housing choice issues in these zones that better meets the needs of all the community.
Supporting Reasons :	The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Kempsey LEP 2013 for the purpose of permitting detached dual occupancies and secondary dwellings in the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 Zones as well as providing development controls via a local clause in the LEP. This will help address housing choice issues in these zones that better meets the needs
Supporting Reasons :	The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Kempsey LEP 2013 for the purpose of permitting detached dual occupancies and secondary dwellings in the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 Zones as well as providing development controls via a local clause in the LEP. This will help address housing choice issues in these zones that better meets the needs
	The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Kempsey LEP 2013 for the purpose of permitting detached dual occupancies and secondary dwellings in the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 Zones as well as providing development controls via a local clause in the LEP. This will help address housing choice issues in these zones that better meets the needs of all the community.
Signature:	The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Kempsey LEP 2013 for the purpose of permitting detached dual occupancies and secondary dwellings in the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 Zones as well as providing development controls via a local clause in the LEP. This will help address housing choice issues in these zones that better meets the needs of all the community.