

JR:LEP 2013



28 August 2014

Mr Ashley Albury
NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure
PO Box 58
DUBBO NSW 2830

Dear Ashley

DENILQUIN LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2013 PLANNING PROPOSAL NO 2

At its meeting on 27 August 2014, Council resolved to:

- a Prepare a planning proposal in accordance with section 55(1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 to insert a clause into the Deniliquin Local Environmental Plan 2013 to permit the subdivision of land to create a lot that is less than the minimum lot size in the RU1 Primary Production zone where Council is satisfied that this lot would be used for a use permitted under an existing development consent for that land.
- b Forward the planning proposal to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure in accordance with section 56(1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
- c Request that the local planning making functions in relation to this planning proposal be delegated to Council.

A copy of the planning proposal, the report to Council and the evaluation criteria for the delegation of plan making functions are attached.

Should you have any further inquiries in relation to this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me on (03) 5898 3111.

Yours sincerely

Julie Rogers
MANAGER ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES



DENILQUIN COUNCIL
Achievement through Action

All correspondence to be directed to the General Manager

Civic Centre
Civic Place
PO Box 270
DENILQUIN NSW 2710

Telephone
03 5898 3000

Facsimile
03 5898 3029

Email
council@deniliquin.nsw.gov.au

Website
www.deniliquin.nsw.gov.au

ABN 90 513 847 629





Request for Initial Gateway Determination

Instructions to Users

When forwarding a planning proposal to the Minister under section 56(1), the relevant planning authority must provide the information specified on this form. This form and the required information should be sent to your local Regional Office. Please note one (1) electronic copy and two (2) hard copies of the completed Planning Proposal must be sent to your local Regional Office.

Relevant Planning Authority Details

Name of Relevant Planning Authority:

Contact Person:

Contact Phone Number and Email Address:

Planning Proposal Details - Attachments

1. **LAND INVOLVED** (If relevant - e.g. Street Address and Lot and Deposited Plan): **N/A**
Attached/Completed ☒
2. **MAPS** (If applicable – 1 electronic and 2 hard copy) ☐
 - o Location map showing the land affected by the proposed draft plan in the context of the LGA (tagged 'location map'). **N/A**
 - o Existing zoning map showing the existing zoning of the site and surrounding land and proposed zoning change for the site/s (tagged 'comparative existing/proposed zoning')
3. **PHOTOS and other visual material** (if applicable) ☐
 - o Aerial photos of land affected by the Planning Proposal **N/A**
 - o Photos of land involved and surrounding land uses
4. **COMPLETE PLANNING PROPOSAL** (1 electronic and 2 hard copy) ☒
 - o All matters to be addressed in a planning proposal – including Director-General's requirements for the justification of all planning proposals (other than those that solely reclassify public land) in accordance with a 'Guide to preparing a planning proposal' are completed prior to forwarding to the Regional Office in the first instance. See attached pro-forma.
4. **PLANNING PROPOSAL HAS BEEN SUPPORTED BY COUNCIL** ☒
 - o Council has considered the written planning proposal before it is sent to the Department of Planning.
 - o Attached is Council's resolution to send the written planning proposal to the Department of Planning.

Signed for and on behalf of the Relevant Planning Authority

DATE: DD/MM/YY

Julie Rogers

Julie Rogers

Manager Environmental Services

16/9/14

Attachment 4 – Evaluation criteria for the delegation of plan making functions

Checklist for the review of a request for delegation of plan making functions to councils

Local Government Area:

Deniliquin

Name of draft LEP:

Planning Proposal No 2

Address of Land (if applicable):

Intent of draft LEP:

To permit the subdivision of land to create a lot that is less than the minimum lot size in the RUI zone where Council is satisfied that this lot would be used for a use permitted under an existing development consent.

Additional Supporting Points/Information:

See planning proposal.



Evaluation criteria for the issuing of an Authorisation				
(NOTE - where the matter is identified as relevant and the requirement has not been met, council is attach information to explain why the matter has not been addressed)	Council response		Department assessment	
	Y/N	Not relevant	Agree	Not agree
Is the planning proposal consistent with the Standard Instrument Order, 2006?	Y		✓	
Does the planning proposal contain an adequate explanation of the intent, objectives, and intended outcome of the proposed amendment?	Y		✓	
Are appropriate maps included to identify the location of the site and the intent of the amendment?		✓	✓	
Does the planning proposal contain details related to proposed consultation?	Y		✓	
Is the planning proposal compatible with an endorsed regional or sub-regional planning strategy or a local strategy endorsed by the Director-General?		✓	✓	
Does the planning proposal adequately address any consistency with all relevant S117 Planning Directions?	Y			
Is the planning proposal consistent with all relevant State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs)?	N		✓	
Minor Mapping Error Amendments	Y/N			
Does the planning proposal seek to address a minor mapping error and contain all appropriate maps that clearly identify the error and the manner in which the error will be addressed?		✓	✓	
Heritage LEPs	Y/N			
Does the planning proposal seek to add or remove a local heritage item and is it supported by a strategy/study endorsed by the Heritage Office?		✓	✓	
Does the planning proposal include another form of endorsement or support from the Heritage Office if there is no supporting strategy/study?		✓	✓	
Does the planning proposal potentially impact on an item of State Heritage Significance and if so, have the views of the Heritage Office been obtained?		✓	✓	
Reclassifications	Y/N			
Is there an associated spot rezoning with the reclassification?		✓	✓	
If yes to the above, is the rezoning consistent with an endorsed Plan of Management (POM) or strategy?		✓	✓	
Is the planning proposal proposed to rectify an anomaly in a classification?		✓	✓	
Will the planning proposal be consistent with an adopted POM or other strategy related to the site?		✓	✓	
Will the draft LEP discharge any interests in public land under section 30 of the <i>Local Government Act, 1993</i> ?		✓	✓	

If so, has council identified all interests; whether any rights or interests will be extinguished; any trusts and covenants relevant to the site; and, included a copy of the title with the planning proposal?		/	✓	
Has the council identified that it will exhibit the planning proposal in accordance with the department's Practice Note (PN 09-003) <i>Classification and reclassification of public land through a local environmental plan and Best Practice Guideline for LEPs and Council Land</i> ?		/	✓	
Has council acknowledged in its planning proposal that a Public Hearing will be required and agreed to hold one as part of its documentation?		/	✓	
Spot Rezoning	Y/N			
Will the proposal result in a loss of development potential for the site (ie reduced FSR or building height) that is not supported by an endorsed strategy?		/	✓	
Is the rezoning intended to address an anomaly that has been identified following the conversion of a principal LEP into a Standard Instrument LEP format?		/	✓	
Will the planning proposal deal with a previously deferred matter in an existing LEP and if so, does it provide enough information to explain how the issue that lead to the deferral has been addressed?		/	✓	
If yes, does the planning proposal contain sufficient documented justification to enable the matter to proceed?		/	✓	
Does the planning proposal create an exception to a mapped development standard?		/	✓	
Section 73A matters				
Does the proposed instrument				
a. correct an obvious error in the principal instrument consisting of a misdescription, the inconsistent numbering of provisions, a wrong cross-reference, a spelling error, a grammatical mistake, the insertion of obviously missing words, the removal of obviously unnecessary words or a formatting error?;	N	.	✓	
b. address matters in the principal instrument that are of a consequential, transitional, machinery or other minor nature?; or	N		✓	
c. deal with matters that do not warrant compliance with the conditions precedent for the making of the instrument because they will not have any significant adverse impact on the environment or adjoining land?	N		✓	
(NOTE – the Minister (or Delegate) will need to form an Opinion under section 73(A1)(c) of the Act in order for a matter in this category to proceed).				
NOTES - Where a council responds 'yes' or can demonstrate that the matter is 'not relevant', in most cases, the planning proposal will routinely be delegated to council to finalise as a matter of local planning significance. - Endorsed strategy means a regional strategy, sub-regional strategy, or any other local strategic planning document that is endorsed by the Director-General of the department.				

#. SUBJECT: DENILIKUIN LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2013 – PLANNING PROPOSAL No 2

**FROM: DIRECTOR TECHNICAL SERVICES
MARK DALZELL**

RECOMMENDATION:

DIVISION

In accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act, it is necessary for Council to call a division when voting of any resolution that involves making a planning decision.

That Council:

- a Prepare a planning proposal in accordance with section 55(1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 to insert a clause into the Deniliquin Local Environmental Plan 2013 to permit the subdivision of land to create a lot that is less than the minimum lot size in the RU1 Primary Production zone where Council is satisfied that this lot would be used for a use permitted under an existing development consent for that land.
- b Forward the planning proposal to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure in accordance with section 56(1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
- c Request that the local planning making functions in relation to this planning proposal be delegated to Council.

BACKGROUND:

The Deniliquin Local Environmental Plan 2013 (LEP 2013) requires a minimum lot size of 40ha for subdivision in the RU1 Primary Production zone. Clause 4.2 of LEP 2013 permits the creation of a lot that is less than the minimum lot size in the RU1 zone where the subdivision is for the purpose of primary production. The lot cannot be created if an existing dwelling will be located on it and a dwelling cannot be erected on resulting lot if it is vacant.

There are a number of uses in the RU1 zone that are permissible that are not related to primary production. There is no clause in the LEP 2013 that would allow for a lot to be created that is less than the minimum lot size on which such a use has been legally established.

It is therefore proposed to insert a clause in LEP 2013. It will only apply to those uses which are legally established (ie development consent exists) and the lot could not be created if there was existing residential accommodation (ie dwelling or the like) located on the land. Where there was no existing residential accommodation on the land, Council would not be able to grant development consent for this accommodation to be built on the subject land.

It should be noted that a similar clause existed in the Deniliquin Local Environmental Plan 1997 (LEP 1997).

PLANNING PROPOSAL

It is proposed to insert the following clause:

'Exceptions to minimum lot sizes for certain rural subdivisions

- (1) *The objective of this clause is to enable the subdivision of land in rural areas to create lots of an appropriate size to meet the needs of current permissible uses other than for the purpose of residential accommodation.*
- (2) *This clause applies to land in Zone RU1 Primary Production.*
- (3) *Land to which this clause applies may, with development consent, be subdivided to create a lot of a size that is less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map in relation to that land, if the consent authority is satisfied that the use of the land after the subdivision will be the same use (other than residential accommodation) permitted under the existing development consent for the land.*
- (4) *Development consent must not be granted for the subdivision of land to which this clause applies unless the consent authority is satisfied that:*
 - (a) *the subdivision will not adversely affect the use of the surrounding land for agriculture, and*
 - (b) *the subdivision is necessary for the ongoing operation of the permissible use, and*
 - (c) *the subdivision will not increase rural land use conflict in the locality, and*
 - (d) *the subdivision is appropriate having regard to the natural and physical constraints affecting the land.'*

The planning proposal is considered to be inconsistent with State Environmental Planning Policy (Rural Lands) 2008 and Section 117 Direction 1.5 Rural Lands as it proposed to allow subdivision less than the minimum lot size for the zone. The inconsistency is considered to be justified for the following reasons:

- The inconsistency is of a minor nature and is unlikely to result in a significant number of subdivisions under this clause. The clause will only enable subdivision in a small number of circumstances.
- Non agricultural uses are permissible in the zone and should be able to operate from land that is suitable for these purposes without unnecessarily sterilising agricultural land.
- A similar clause existed in LEP 1997.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND GOVERNMENT AGENCY CONSULTATION

It is proposed to exhibit the planning proposal for 14 days. No government agency consultation is proposed due to a similar clause existing in LEP 1997. However, if the Gateway Determination requires Council to consult with government agencies then this will be done.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:

An amendment to the LEP 2013 is required to insert this clause.

BUDGETARY IMPLICATIONS:

Nil.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Nil.

LEGISLATIVE IMPLICATIONS:

To amend the LEP 2013 a planning proposal must be prepared in accordance with section 55 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act (the Act). This planning proposal is then forwarded to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure in accordance with section 56(1) of the Act and a gateway determination is then issued in accordance with section 56(2).

Council will request that the plan making delegations functions be delegated to Council due to the minor nature of the planning proposal.

A copy of the planning proposal is attached and a copy of the request for the delegation of plan making functions to Council is also attached.

RISK ASSESSMENT:

What can happen?

Legally established non agricultural uses in the RU1 zone will not be able to create a lot that is suitable for that use.

How can it happen?

By not inserting this clause into LEP 2013.

What are the consequences of the event happening?

Land could be sterilised from agricultural production if the minimum lot size for a legally established non agricultural use is maintained at 40ha.

What is the likelihood of the event happening?

Medium.

Adequacy of existing controls?

No such clause currently exists in LEP 2013.

Treatment options to mitigate the risk?

Amend LEP 2013 by inserting the appropriate clause.

CONCLUSION:

Council should amend LEP 2013.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Planning Proposal – 11 pages
 2. Evaluation Criteria for the Delegation of Plan Making Functions – 3 pages
-



Planning Proposal No 2

This planning proposal has been prepared to insert a clause into the Deniliquin Local Environmental Plan 2013 to permit the subdivision of land to create a lot that is less than the minimum lot size in the RU1 Primary Production zone where Council is satisfied that this lot would be used for a use permitted under an existing development consent for that land. This clause would not apply to lots where there was existing residential accommodation.

PART 1 OBJECTIVES OR INTENDED OUTCOMES

The objective of this planning proposal is to permit the subdivision of land to create a lot that is less than the minimum lot size in the RU1 Primary Production zone where Council is satisfied that this lot would be used for a use permitted under an existing development consent for that land. This clause would not apply to lots where there was residential accommodation.

PART 2 EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS

The proposed outcome will be achieved by amending LEP 2013 by inserting the following clause into Part 4:

'Exceptions to minimum lot sizes for certain rural subdivisions

- (1) *The objective of this clause is to enable the subdivision of land in rural areas to create lots of an appropriate size to meet the needs of current permissible uses other than for the purpose of residential accommodation.*
- (2) *This clause applies to land in Zone RU1 Primary Production.*
- (3) *Land to which this clause applies may, with development consent, be subdivided to create a lot of a size that is less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map in relation to that land, if the consent authority is satisfied that the use of the land after the subdivision will be the same use (other than residential accommodation) permitted under the existing development consent for the land.*
- (4) *Development consent must not be granted for the subdivision of land to which this clause applies unless the consent authority is satisfied that:*
 - (a) *the subdivision will not adversely affect the use of the surrounding land for agriculture, and*
 - (b) *the subdivision is necessary for the ongoing operation of the permissible use, and*
 - (c) *the subdivision will not increase rural land use conflict in the locality, and*
 - (d) *the subdivision is appropriate having regard to the natural and physical constraints affecting the land.'*

PART 3 JUSTIFICATION

The objectives of the RU1 Primary Production zone encourage the development of agricultural related uses and a range of non agricultural uses that are compatible with the character of the zone. Clause 4.2 of the LEP 2013 permits the subdivision of land in the RU1 zone to create a lot less than the minimum lot size where that lot is being created for the purpose of primary production. Primary production is not defined in the LEP 2013 but the term does not necessarily cover all uses which are permissible in the zone eg camping grounds, eco-tourist facilities, landscaping material supplies, depots etc. These uses do not necessarily need a land area that complies with the 40ha minimum lot size in the RU1 zone in order to operate. The inclusion of this clause in the LEP 2013 would mean that those

uses, where they have development consent, would be able to create a lot on which they are established that is less than the minimum lot size.

This would not be a new provision for Deniliquin as there was a similar provision in the Deniliquin Local Environmental Plan 1997 (LEP 1997).

Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report?

The planning proposal is not the result of any strategic study or report.

Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?

Subdivision below the minimum lot size in the RU1 zone for purposes other than primary production can only be achieved by the inclusion of a new clause.

Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy?

There is no regional or sub-regional strategy for the Deniliquin Local Government area.

Is the planning proposal consistent with a council local strategy or other local strategic plan?

Deniliquin Council does not have a local strategy or other local strategic plan.

Is the planning proposal consistent with the applicable State Environmental Planning Policies?

The planning proposal is consistent with all State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) except for SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008. All SEPPs are considered in Appendix 1.

Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s117 directions)?

The planning proposal is consistent with all Section 117 Directions except for 1.5 Rural Lands. All directions are considered in Appendix 2.

Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?

No. Any impact on threatened species would be identified when a development application was submitted for a subdivision.

Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?

No. This clause is only to enable subdivision in particular circumstances. Environmental impacts would be considered at the development application stage.

Has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?

Some consideration has been given to the social and economic effects in Appendix 1 and 2. The draft clause will enable subdivision in particular circumstances and will aid economic development in that uses that are permissible in the RU1 zone will be able to use land that is of a size that is suitable for the use. The clause will mean that land that is not required for non agricultural uses will not be unnecessarily sterilised due to the minimum lot size in this zone.

Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

Not applicable.

What are the views of state and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the Gateway determination?

Council does not propose to consult with any State or Commonwealth public authorities given that this provision existed under LEP 1997 and still applies to land zoned 1(a) General Rural in the deferred area under LEP 2013.

PART 4 MAPPING

There is no mapping for this clause.

PART 5 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

In accordance with section 57 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, it is proposed to exhibit the planning proposal for 14 days in the local media and on Council's website and adjoining Councils will be notified.

PART 6 PROJECT TIMELINE

Given the nature of the amendment, Council proposes to complete the amendment in 6 months.



Appendix 1

Consideration of State Environmental Planning Policies

SEPPs	Consistent	Comments
SEPP 21 Caravan Parks	n/a	-
SEPP 30 Intensive Agriculture	n/a	This SEPP sets out requirements for the use of land for intensive agriculture. This proposed amendment to the LEP 2013 will potentially reduce the amount of land available for intensive agriculture. However, this draft amendment will only permit the creation of a lot below the minimum lot size where that lot has a legally established use.
SEPP 32 Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land)	n/a	-
SEPP 33 Hazardous and Offensive Development	n/a	-
SEPP 36 Manufactured Home Estates	n/a	-
SEPP 50 Canal Estate Development	n/a	-
SEPP 52 Farm Dams and Other Works in Land and Water Management Plan Areas	n/a	This SEPP affects land zoned RU1 Primary Production in Deniliquin. The proposed amendment for the LEP 2013 will potentially reduce the amount of land available for works under this SEPP. However, this draft amendment will only permit the creation of a lot below the minimum lot size where that lot has a legally established use.
SEPP 55 Remediation of Land	n/a	-
SEPP 62 Sustainable Aquaculture	n/a	This SEPP sets out requirements for the use of land for aquaculture. This proposed amendment to the LEP 2013 will potentially reduce the amount of land available for aquaculture. However, this draft amendment will only permit the creation of a lot below the minimum lot size where that lot has a legally established use.
SEPP 64 Advertising and Signage	n/a	-
SEPP 65 Design Quality of Residential Flat Development	n/a	-
SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009	n/a	-
SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004	n/a	-

SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008	n/a	-
SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004	n/a	-
SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007	n/a	This SEPP sets out consent requirements for infrastructure development. The draft amendment could benefit infrastructure development as it will allow for a lot to be created which is less than the minimum lot size where that development has been legally established (note that the Code SEPP allows for the creation of a lot for a public purpose as exempt development) without unnecessarily sterilising land for agricultural purposes.
SEPP (Major Development) 2005	n/a	-
SEPP (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007	n/a	This SEPP sets out consent requirements for mining, petroleum production and extractive industries. The draft amendment to the LEP 2013 could benefit infrastructure development as it will allow for a lot to be created which less than the minimum lot size where that development has been legally established without unnecessarily sterilising land for agricultural purposes.
SEPP (Miscellaneous Consent Provisions) 2007	n/a	-
SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008	No	This SEPP aims to protect and development rural land for rural and related purposes. The draft amendment is inconsistent with this SEPP as it will allow the creation of a lot for non agricultural uses which are below with the minimum lot size. Consideration of the Rural Subdivision Principles from the Rural Lands SEPP under the Section 117 Directions in Appendix 2 has concluded that any inconsistency is justified. Refer to Appendix 2 for comments.
SEPP (State and Regional Development) 2011	n/a	This SEPP sets out consent requirements for state and regional development. The draft amendment to the LEP 2013 could benefit this type of development as it will allow for a lot to be created which less than the minimum lot size where that development has been legally established without unnecessarily sterilising land for agricultural purposes.



Appendix 2

Consideration of Section 117 Directions

Section 117 Direction		Consistent	Comments
1.1 Business and Industrial Zones		n/a	-
1.2 Rural Zones		n/a	This direction does not apply to this draft amendment as cl 4(a) applies only to the rezoning of rural land to a residential, business, industrial, village or tourist zone.
1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries		n/a	-
1.5 Rural Lands		No	This direction applies to the draft amendment as it affects land within an existing rural zone and it impacts on the minimum lot size on land within a rural zone. It is considered that the inconsistency with this direction is justified as it is of minor significance given the consideration of the Rural Subdivision Principles (below) and that it is unlikely to result in a significant number of subdivisions under this clause. In addition to this, the subdivision of the land will be only for legally established uses and will prevent the sterilisation of rural land. The following comments are made in relation to the Rural Subdivision Principles in SEPP(Rural Lands) 2008: a) The minimisation of rural land fragmentation. <i>This planning proposal will not result in significant rural land fragmentation as it only applies to those non-agricultural uses for which development consent has been obtained. The clause is unlikely to result in a significant number of lots being created under this clause given the rate and types of development occurring in Deniliquin. In addition to this, these non agricultural uses are permissible in the zone and should be able to operate from land that is suitable for these purposes without unnecessarily sterilising agricultural land.</i> b) The minimisation of rural land use conflicts, particularly between residential land uses and other rural land uses. <i>Land use conflicts can be considered at the development application stage.</i> c) The consideration of the nature of existing agricultural holdings and the existing and planned future supply of rural residential land when considering lot sizes for

		rural lands. Not applicable. d) The consideration of the natural and physical constraints and opportunities of land. <i>The land use table for the RU1 zone allows for a number of uses other than agricultural uses to be developed in this zone where they are compatible with the character of the zones. This provides a number of opportunities for the zone. Natural and physical constraints of land are identified in the LEP and in the DA assessment process.</i> e) Ensuring that planning for dwelling opportunities takes account of those constraints. <i>This principle is not applicable to the draft amendment as the clause does not permit the creation of a lot less than the minimum lot size where there is a dwelling or dual occupancy located on the land. Cl 4.2B would also prevent the erection of a dwelling or dual occupancy on a lot created under the draft amendment as it would be less than the minimum lot size.</i>
2.1 Environment Protection Zones	n/a	-
2.3 Heritage Conservation	n/a	-
2.4 Recreation Vehicle Areas	n/a	-
3.1 Residential Zones	n/a	-
3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Homes Estates	n/a	-
3.3 Home Occupations	n/a	-
3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport	n/a	-
3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes	n/a	The draft amendment will affect land near licensed aerodromes but the direction is not applicable as it is not proposed to alter any provision in the LEP relating to development near the aerodrome.
3.6 Shooting Ranges	n/a	-
4.3 Flood Prone Land	n/a	The draft amendment will affect flood prone land but the direction is not applicable as it is not proposed to alter any provisions in the LEP relating to flooding.

4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection	n/a	The draft amendment will affect or is in proximity to land mapped as bushfire prone land. The direction is not applicable as the clause will enable subdivision in a particular zone and bushfire can be considered at the DA stage.
6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements	n/a	-
6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes	n/a	-
6.3 Site Specific Provisions	n/a	-

