

Proposal Title : Broken Hill 2014 Section 73 A amendment To correct the purpose of the Zone SP1 Special Activities (Mining) to Zone SP1 Special Proposal Summary Activities (Mining and Extractive Industry) at Holten Drive, Broken Hill. This correction would provide permissibility of extractive industry, which is the ongoing and intended use of the subject site. PP Number PP 2014 BROKE 001 00 Dop File No : 14/07916 **Proposal Details** LGA covered : Date Planning 09-Jul-2014 **Broken Hill** Proposal Received RPA: **Broken Hill City Council** Region : Western Section of the Act : MURRAY DARLING 73A - Minor Matter State Electorate : LEP Type : 73A **Location Details** Street : Postcode : Suburb : City: Land Parcel : 1 Holten Drive Broken Hill 2880 **DoP Planning Officer Contact Details** Contact Name : **Ryan Thomas** Contact Number : 0268412196 Contact Email : ryan.thomas@planning.nsw.gov.au **RPA Contact Details** Contact Name : **Tracey Stephens** Contact Number : 0880803340 Contact Email : Tracey.Stephens@brokenhill.nsw.gov.au **DoP Project Manager Contact Details** Contact Name : Wayne Garnsey Contact Number : 0268412192 Contact Email : wayne.garnsey@planning.nsw.gov.au Land Release Data Release Area Name : Growth Centre :

Broken Hill 2014 Section 73 A amendment

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 :			
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :	No known meetings or communic	ations	
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	The planning proposal seeks to correct an unintended exclusion of extractive industry from the permitted uses within Zone SP1 when translating the zoning to the Broken Hill LEP 2013. The primary use of the subject land is for extractive industry, being a quarry and concrete batching. The quarry extracts and processes a range of crushed rock type for aggregates, road base products, rail ballast, concrete aggregate and landscape supplies.		
	The quarry business operator wants to lodge a Development Application to seek approval for the continued use as a quarry and for proposed increase in extraction of materials. However, due to an anomaly created when translating the zoning when making the Broken Hill LEP 2013, extractive industry is now prohibited at the site. The use of the site can continue through existing use rights, however does not provide enough flexibility for expansion.		
	The site was Zone 1(m) Mining in the former Broken Hill Local Environmental Plan 1996 and the zoning allowed for both mining and extractive industry.		
	Zone SP1 allows for environmental protection works, roads and the purpose shown on the Land Zoning Map, including any development that is ordinarily incidental or ancillary to development for that purpose. Any other development is prohibited. In this case the definition is mining. However, the zone now prohibits extractive industry as the definition of mining does not extend to extractive industry as outlined in the below dictionary terms.		
	"mining" means mining carried of under the Offshore Minerals Act 1 a) the construction, operation and b) the rehabilitation of land affect	999, and includes: I decommissioning of associa	-
	"extractive industry" means the w from a mine) by methods such as the storing, stockpiling or proces recycling, washing, crushing, saw	vinning or removal of extractiv excavating, dredging, tunnel sing of extractive materials b ving or separating, but does r	lling or quarrying, including y methods such as not include turf farming.
	"extractive materials" means sand minerals within the meaning of th	-	substances that are not

I

Ì.

	Therefore, as the purpose of the Zone SP1 does not explicitly allow extractive industry, the intended increase in extraction of materials is prohibited under the zoning and the existing use rights do not extend to the increase.
	The amendment seeks to correct the unintended exclusion of extractive industry.
	It is requested that Section 73A be considered to change the description of the
	SP1(Mining) Zone in Land Zoning Map - Sheet LZN-005A to also include extractive industry.
	Under Section 73A, Expedited amendments of environmental planning instruments: "An amending environmental planning instrument may be made under this Part without compliance with the provisions of this Part relating to the conditions precedent to the making of the instrument if the instrument, if made, would amend or repeal a provision of a principal instrument in order to do any one or more of the following:
	a) correct an obvious error in the principal instrument consisting of a misdescription the insertion of obviously missing words
	b) address matters in the principal instrument that are of a transitional or other minor nature."
	It is assessed that the matter could fall under either subclause (a) or (b). Council had sought to transition its previous zoning at this site and therefore this could be considered as a misdescription or obviously missing words under 73A(1)(a) or transitional under 73A (1)(b). The matter is also considered as minor under 73(1)(b) as the previous zoning included extractive industry and the ongoing and proposed future use has been extractive industry.
	It is assessed that this planning proposal should proceed as the matter is considered minor and allows a previously permissible use to continue. It also allows the opportunity for the land owners to apply to intensify the current use of the site through the development application process.
External Supporting Notes :	

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

The amendment would correct a definition translation error that occurred when translating zoning that applies to an operating quarry site when making the Broken Hill LEP 2013.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment : The current zoning inadvertently omits the ongoing use of extractive industry. The amendment would extend the purpose of the Zone SP1 to include extractive industry to correct the translation error that occurred when making the Broken Hill LEP 2013.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? No

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

* May need the Director General's agreement

Is the Director Gene	eral's agreement required? N/A			
	ndard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes			
d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? N/A				
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :				
Hove inconsistencies w	vith items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? N/A			
If No, explain :	with terns a), b) and d) being adequately justified? WA			
lapping Provided -	- s55(2)(d)			
Is mapping provided?	Yes			
Comment :	Concept mapping is provided and is adequate for section 73A review purposes. The planning proposal will require an amendment to Map - Sheet LSZ_005.			
	Council has provided mapping showing the proposed mapping changes for Lot Size Map - Sheet LSZ_005. Final mapping must comply with the technical guidelines prior to submission to Parliamentary Counsel.			
community consult	tation - s55(2)(e)			
Has community consul	tation been proposed? No			
Comment :	An amendment under section 73A does not require exhibition.			
Are there any additiona	General's requirements al Director General's requirements? N/A			
If Yes, reasons :				
	f the proposal			
If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy o Does the proposal mee	f the proposal at the adequacy criteria? Yes			
Overall adequacy o Does the proposal mee				
Overall adequacy o Does the proposal mee If No, comment :	et the adequacy criteria? Yes Council has submitted all the required information to allow the Department to assess its proposal as an amendment under section 73A of the EP&A Act.			
Dverall adequacy o Does the proposal mee If No, comment : posal Assessment	et the adequacy criteria? Yes Council has submitted all the required information to allow the Department to assess its proposal as an amendment under section 73A of the EP&A Act.			
)verall adequacy o	et the adequacy criteria? Yes Council has submitted all the required information to allow the Department to assess its proposal as an amendment under section 73A of the EP&A Act.			
Overall adequacy o Does the proposal mee If No, comment : posal Assessment rincipal LEP:	et the adequacy criteria? Yes Council has submitted all the required information to allow the Department to assess its proposal as an amendment under section 73A of the EP&A Act.			
Dverall adequacy o Does the proposal mee If No, comment : posal Assessment rincipal LEP: Due Date : August 201 Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	et the adequacy criteria? Yes Council has submitted all the required information to allow the Department to assess its proposal as an amendment under section 73A of the EP&A Act.			
Dverall adequacy o Does the proposal mee If No, comment : posal Assessment rincipal LEP: Due Date : August 201 Comments in relation to Principal	et the adequacy criteria? Yes Council has submitted all the required information to allow the Department to assess its proposal as an amendment under section 73A of the EP&A Act.			

Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The proposal is consistent with the endorsed Broken Hill City Council Land Use Strategy dated September 2012.				
	The proposed amendment would allow the expansion of an ongoing and intended operating use at this site.				
Environmental social economic impacts :	The site is currently operating and council does not intend to change the permitted use of this site and therefore the continuation of the ongoing use is considered to have positive economic impacts and not to have detrimental social impacts or expectations.				
	The proposed amendment would allow permissibility of extractive industry on the site and environmental social and economic impacts can be considered at the development application stage.				
ssessment Proces	38				
Proposal type :	Minor	Community Consultation Period :	Nil		
Fimeframe to make ₋EP :	6 months	Delegation :	RPA		
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) d) :					
s Public Hearing by the	e PAC required?	No			
2)(a) Should the matte	er proceed ?	Yes			
f no, provide reasons :					
Resubmission - s56(2)	(b) : No				
f Yes, reasons :					
dentify any additional s	studies, if required.				
f Other, provide reasor	ns :				
dentify any internal co	nsultations, if required :				
No internal consultation	on required				
s the provision and fur	nding of state infrastructure	e relevant to this plan? No			
f Yes, reasons :					
uments					
Document File Name		DocumentType Na	ame Is Public		
73a submission-0907	2014100319.pdf	Proposal Coverin	g Letter Yes		
council resolution-090		Proposal	Yes		
cover letter-09072014	110712#2.pdf	Proposal Coverin Proposal Coverin	-		
revised proposal.pdf					

Broken Hill 2014 Section 73 A amendment

Planning Team Recommendation				
Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions				
S.117 directions:				
Additional Information :	The section s73A Amendment should proceed subject to the following conditions:			
	1. This is a minor matter that can be dealt with under section 73A of the EP&A Act.			
	2. No public or agency consultation is required under Section 56 (c), 56 (e) or 57 of the EP&A Act.			
	3. The proposed change to LEP mapping is to comply with the Departments 'Standard Technical Requirements for LEP Maps' - prior to submission to Parliamentary Counsel.			
	4. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 6 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.			
Supporting Reasons ;	It is assessed that the matter can be approved to proceed through either subclause (a) or (b) of Section 73A(1) of the EP&A Act. Council had sought to transition its previous zoning at this site and therefore this could be considered as a misdescription or obviously missing words under 73A(1)(a) or transitional under 73A (1)(b). The matter is also considered as minor under 73(1)(b) as the previous zoning included extractive industry and the ongoing and proposed future use has been extractive industry.			
It is assessed that this planning proposal should proceed as the matter is considered minor and allows a previously permissible use to continue. It also allows the opportun for the land owners to apply to intensify the current use of the site through the development application process.				
Signature:	S			
Printed Name:	R-1AN THOMAS Date: 16/7/14			

Endoused Myamoey 16/7/14 A/Team leader.

ì