

Planning

# Planning Team Report

Proposal Title :	Kyogle LEP 2012 – Detached I	Dual Occupancy and Secon	dary Dwelling Provisions
Proposal Summary :	The proposal seeks to amend	the Kyogle Local Environm	nental Plan (LEP) 2012 to:
	2. Permit 'secondary dwellir	ngs' with consent in the RU	the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 zones; 1, RU2, RU4, R1 and R5 zones; and be up to 60% of the total floor area of
PP Number :	PP_2014_KYOGL_001_00	Dop File No :	14/04282
oposal Details			Dise Office
Date Planning Proposal Received :	06-Mar-2014	LGA covered :	Kyogle
Region :	Northern	RPA :	Kyogle Council
State Electorate :	LISMORE	Section of the Act	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Policy		
D. C. H.			
ocation Details	8		
Street :			and the second se
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :
Land Parcei : All	land zoned for rural and residen	tial purposes	
DoP Planning Offi	cer Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Luke Blandford		
Contact Number :	0266416612		
Contact Email :	luke.blandford@planning.nsw.g	gov.au	
RPA Contact Deta	ils		
Contact Name :	Lachlan Black		
Contact Number :	0266320293		
Contact Email :	Lachlan.Black@kyogle.nsw.gov	v.au	
DoP Project Mana	ger Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Jim Clark		
Contact Number :	0266416604		

and Release Data			
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Far North Coast Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes
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 :	•	Code of Practice in relation to c lied with to the best of the Regi	(m)
Have there been meetings or	Νο		
communications with registered lobbyists? :			
If Yes, comment :	-	met with any lobbyists in relation of any meeting between other	
Supporting notes		2	
Internal Supporting Notes :	dwellings in the rural zones. It	y allows attached dual occupan t is therefore unlikely that permi rural areas will have a significa y permissible in the LEP.	tting secondary dwellings or
	• • •	t the provision of detached dual sidential areas is a matter of loc	· · ·
External Supporting Notes :			March 199
equacy Assessmen	it		C. Carriero de
Statement of the ob	jectives - s55(2)(a)		
Is a statement of the ob	ojectives provided? Yes		
Comment	expressed. The proposal se	d outcomes of the proposal are eeks to amend the provisions of d detached dual occupancies.	provided and adequately f Kyogle LEP 2012 as they apply
Explanation of prov	isions provided - s55(2)(b	)	
Is an explanation of pro	visions provided? Yes		
Comment :	objectives and intended ou in the LEP can be summari		

# Kyogle LEP 2012 – Detached Dual Occupancy and Secondary Dwelling Provisions 2. List 'dual occupancies' as permissible with consent in the land use tables of the RU1, RU2, RU4 and R5 zones; 3. List 'secondary dwellings' as permissible with consent in the land use tables of the RU1, RU2, RU4, R1 & R5 zones; Amend Clause 4.2(A) to remove dual occupancies (attached) and replace with the 4 group term 'dual occupancies'; and 5. Amend Clause 5.4(9) to increase the permitted total floor area of secondary dwellings from 43% to 60% of the total floor area of the principal dwelling. Justification - s55 (2)(c) a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes b) S.117 directions identified by RPA : **1.2 Rural Zones** 1.5 Rural Lands \* May need the Director General's agreement **3.1 Residential Zones** 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 5.3 Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 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 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 e) List any other In addition to the s117 Directions nominated by the RPA, the following Directions also matters that need to apply: be considered : 2.1 Environmental Protection Zones 2.3 Heritage Conservation 2.4 Recreation Vehicle Areas 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 6.3 Site Specific Provisions An assessment of the applicable directions and SEPPs is provided within the 'Assessment' section of this planning team report. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : See the 'Assessment' section of this planning team report Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? No Comment : None of the proposed amendments require modification to any map sheet under Kyogle LEP 2012. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment: Council has indicated a 28 day public exhibition/community consultation period. The proposal will be notified in the local newspaper, in Council's newsletter and on Council's website. This is considered appropriate.

Are there any addition	al Director General's requirements? No
If Yes, reasons :	
in res, reasons .	
Overall adequacy o	of the proposal
Does the proposal me	et 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 to achieve the
	outcomes;
	<ol> <li>Providing an adequate justification for the proposal;</li> <li>Outlining a proposed community consultation program including public exhibition;</li> <li>Providing a project timeline which suggests completion within 8 months; and</li> <li>Providing an evaluation for the delegation of plan making functions.</li> </ol>
	DELECATION AUTHORICATION
	DELEGATION AUTHORISATION Kyogle Council has formally accepted plan-making delegations for planning proposals and has requested delegation for this proposal. The Gateway should consider delegating the plan making functions to Council for this proposal.
	PROJECT TIMELINE
	Council's timeline anticipates the planning proposal will be submitted for legal drafting in October 2014 (approximately 8 months). In addition to finalising the plan, Council has indicated that a Development Control Plan (DCP) amendment will be prepared to provide guidelines for detached dual occupancies and secondary dwellings in rural areas. It is
	recommended that a 9 month timeframe should be sufficient to complete the plan, and any associated DCP amendment. This does not prevent Council from finalising the plan in a shorter timeframe or prior to the commencement of the DCP.
	recommended that a 9 month timeframe should be sufficient to complete the plan, and any associated DCP amendment. This does not prevent Council from finalising the plan
oposal Assessmen	recommended that a 9 month timeframe should be sufficient to complete the plan, and any associated DCP amendment. This does not prevent Council from finalising the plan in a shorter timeframe or prior to the commencement of the DCP. It is noted that the timeline indicates that the proposal will be submitted to the agency for finalisation, rather than being finalised under Council's delegation. This should be updated prior to exhibition.
	recommended that a 9 month timeframe should be sufficient to complete the plan, and any associated DCP amendment. This does not prevent Council from finalising the plan in a shorter timeframe or prior to the commencement of the DCP. It is noted that the timeline indicates that the proposal will be submitted to the agency for finalisation, rather than being finalised under Council's delegation. This should be updated prior to exhibition.
Principal LEP: Due Date :	recommended that a 9 month timeframe should be sufficient to complete the plan, and any associated DCP amendment. This does not prevent Council from finalising the plan in a shorter timeframe or prior to the commencement of the DCP. It is noted that the timeline indicates that the proposal will be submitted to the agency for finalisation, rather than being finalised under Council's delegation. This should be updated prior to exhibition.
Principal LEP:	recommended that a 9 month timeframe should be sufficient to complete the plan, and any associated DCP amendment. This does not prevent Council from finalising the plan in a shorter timeframe or prior to the commencement of the DCP. It is noted that the timeline indicates that the proposal will be submitted to the agency for finalisation, rather than being finalised under Council's delegation. This should be updated prior to exhibition.
Principal LEP: Due Date : Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	recommended that a 9 month timeframe should be sufficient to complete the plan, and any associated DCP amendment. This does not prevent Council from finalising the plan in a shorter timeframe or prior to the commencement of the DCP. It is noted that the timeline indicates that the proposal will be submitted to the agency for finalisation, rather than being finalised under Council's delegation. This should be updated prior to exhibition. t The Kyogle LEP 2012 commenced in February 2013. This planning proposal seeks amendment to the Kyogle LEP 2012.
Principal LEP: Due Date : Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	recommended that a 9 month timeframe should be sufficient to complete the plan, and any associated DCP amendment. This does not prevent Council from finalising the plan in a shorter timeframe or prior to the commencement of the DCP. It is noted that the timeline indicates that the proposal will be submitted to the agency for finalisation, rather than being finalised under Council's delegation. This should be updated prior to exhibition. It The Kyogle LEP 2012 commenced in February 2013. This planning proposal seeks amendment to the Kyogle LEP 2012.
Principal LEP: Due Date : Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Assessment Criter Need for planning	recommended that a 9 month timeframe should be sufficient to complete the plan, and any associated DCP amendment. This does not prevent Council from finalising the plan in a shorter timeframe or prior to the commencement of the DCP. It is noted that the timeline indicates that the proposal will be submitted to the agency for finalisation, rather than being finalised under Council's delegation. This should be updated prior to exhibition. It The Kyogle LEP 2012 commenced in February 2013. This planning proposal seeks amendment to the Kyogle LEP 2012.
Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Assessment Criter Need for planning	recommended that a 9 month timeframe should be sufficient to complete the plan, and any associated DCP amendment. This does not prevent Council from finalising the plan in a shorter timeframe or prior to the commencement of the DCP. It is noted that the timeline indicates that the proposal will be submitted to the agency for finalisation, rather than being finalised under Council's delegation. This should be updated prior to exhibition. It The Kyogle LEP 2012 commenced in February 2013. This planning proposal seeks amendment to the Kyogle LEP 2012.

# flexible development and home ownership outcomes in rural areas.

DUAL OCCUPANCIES IN RURAL RESIDENTIAL AREAS Dual occupancies are permitted in the R1 and R3 zones under the Kyogle LEP 2012 but prohibited in the R5 zone.

Council seeks to permit dual occupancies (both attached and detached) in the R5 zone to ensure a consistent planning approach is applied across all of the rural and residential zones in the LEP.

Dual occupancies in rural residential areas would increase housing opportunity and promote efficient use of existing services and facilities.

#### SECONDARY DWELLINGS IN THE R1 & R5 ZONES

Council seeks to list secondary dwellings in the R1 and R5 land use zone tables. This is to ensure affordable rental housing opportunities are provided in the residential and rural residential areas of the Kyogle LGA.

Council is aware that secondary dwellings are already permissible in the R1 and R5 zones under State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009. Council officers have indicated that this was proposed to ensure secondary dwellings remain permissible under the LEP should there ever be an amendment to the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP.

Whilst the proposal is not inconsistent with the SEPP, the SEPP prevails and also provides provisions for secondary dwellings as complying development in the R1 and R5 zones. Listing 'secondary dwellings' in the R1 and R5 land use tables under the LEP would therefore have no effect. This is a matter to be considered at legal drafting stage and should not impact the Gateway.

#### ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA FOR SECONDARY DWELLINGS

Council has indicated that the current 43% floor area limit for secondary dwellings is impractical considering the existing and anticipated future housing stock within the Kyogle LGA. The proposal seeks to increase this maximum total floor area for secondary dwellings to 60% of the principal dwelling size, to provide greater opportunity for desirable affordable housing options. It is noted that floor areas up to 50% of the principal dwelling's size have been applied to other SI LEPs in the Northern Region.

In accordance with Clause 22(2)(b) of the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP the maximum floor area of a secondary dwelling in a residential zone is to be 60m2 or the maximum floor area specified under any other applicable environmental planning instrument. Clause 22(4) (b) also stipulates that car parking is not required onsite for secondary dwellings in addition to what has been provided for the principal dwelling.

This entails secondary dwellings could be established in residential areas of the Kyogle LGA that have a floor area of up to 60% of the principal dwelling's floor area and no additional car parking provision. Council officers are aware of these provisions and consider that there will not be any detrimental impact on amenity, traffic and access within residential areas of the LGA.

It is considered that the proposed amendments to the Kyogle LEP as discussed above are the best means of enabling the objectives of the planning proposal.

Consistency with strategic planning framework :

## FAR NORTH COAST REGIONAL STRATEGY (FNCRS)

The FNCRS was released in 2007 and identifies the Government's key strategic directions for the Far North Coast.

The proposal is considered to be consistent with the actions outlined under the strategy given that:

It will promote housing choice, location and affordability; and

• There will be no net increase in dwellings permissible on rural land, given that attached dual occupancies and rural workers' dwellings are already permissible.

#### KYOGLE LOCAL GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The Kyogle Local Growth Management Strategy 2010 outlines an urban and employment land release program for Kyogle Shire until 2031. It was endorsed by the Director General on 22 June 2010.

A key action under the Strategy is to review local planning controls to encourage more affordable housing outcomes. As discussed above, Council is seeking to permit detached dual occupancies and secondary dwellings in the rural zones to promote affordable housing opportunity and lifestyle choice. This is considered a local matter and not inconsistent with Council's approved Strategy.

#### STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICIES SEPP Rural Lands

The proposal will contribute to the social and economic welfare of rural communities, through increased housing opportunity and affordability and without increasing dwelling permissibility beyond that already allowed under the LEP. The potential to impact on agricultural land and activities however would be addressed through the development application process.

Council has indicated that development guidelines will be prepared through a DCP amendment, to assist in the planning and delivery of dual occupancies and secondary dwellings in rural areas. These guidelines would need to be addressed under a development application and would relate to matters such as land use conflict separation, agricultural and site suitability.

It is noted that clause 6.4 Essential Services of the Kyogle LEP 2012 provides that development consent will not be granted unless it can be demonstrated that a proposed development can be appropriately serviced.

These guidelines and provisions will assist in minimising/managing any potential impact on rural lands and activities.

The proposal is not inconsistent with the Rural Planning Principles under the SEPP.

#### SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009

The SEPP provides a consistent planning approach for secondary dwellings throughout the State. The SEPP permits secondary dwellings as affordable housing options in residential zones only.

Permitting secondary dwellings in rural zones is a local matter and not inconsistent with the SEPP. As discussed above, Council has indicated that a DCP will be prepared to guide development outcomes for secondary dwellings in rural areas.

The proposed inclusion of secondary dwellings in the R1 and R5 Land Use Tables of the Kyogle LEP 2012 is not inconsistent with the SEPP, however the provision would have no effect given that the SEPP prevails. This is a matter to be addressed at legal drafting stage.

The proposal is consistent with the provisions of all other applicable SEPPs.

#### SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils

-			
		The proposal will enable additional development on land which may contain acid sulfate soils. The proposal is inconsistent with this direction as it proposes an intensification of land uses on land identified as containing acid sulfate soils and is not supported by a study assessing the appropriateness of the land. Development of a detached dual occupancy or secondary dwelling is unlikely to have any significant impact on acid sulfate soils. Any development would be subject to Council's acid sulfate provisions under the LEP and any potential impact would be addressed at development application stage. The proposal's inconsistency with this direction can be justified as of minor significance.	
		4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection This 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.	
		The proposal is consistent with all other relevant Section 117 Directions.	
	Environmental social economic impacts :	The proposal will have a net community benefit through increased housing opportunity and affordability, particularly for rural workers, their families and the aging population.	
		Any potential direct impacts on the natural and built environment will be considered through the development application process. The provisions under the Kyogle LEP and DCP will guide development outcomes to minimise potential impacts.	

# **Assessment Process**

Proposal type :	Routine		Community Consultation Period :	28 Days
Timeframe to make LEP :	9 months		Delegation :	RPA
Public Authority	NSW Rural Fire	Service		
Consultation - 56(2)				
(d) :				
Is Public Hearing by th	e PAC required?	No		
(2)(a) Should the matte	er proceed ?	Yes		
If no, provide reasons :	:			
Resubmission - s56(2)	(b) : <b>No</b>			
If Yes, reasons :				
Identify any additional	studies, if required. :			
If Other, provide reaso	ns :			
Identify any internal co	onsultations, if require	ed :		
No internal consultati	ion required			
Is the provision and fur	nding of state infrast	ucture relevant	t to this plan? <b>No</b>	
If Yes, reasons :				

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	Is Public
Cover letter.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Planning Proposal.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Attachment_1_Information_checklist_LEP amend 3.doc	Proposal	Yes
Attachment_4_Evaluation_criteria_delegation_LEP	Proposal	Yes

# Planning Team Recommendation

Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions

S.117 directions:	1.2 Rural Zones
	1.5 Rural Lands
	3.1 Residential Zones
	4.3 Flood Prone Land
	4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
	5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies
	5.3 Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast
	6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
Additional Information :	The planning proposal should proceed as a "routine" planning proposal and an authorisation to exercise plan making delegations should be issued to Council.
	The Director-General's delegate should agree that inconsistency with s117 Direction 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils is of minor significance and that consistency with Direction 4.4
	Planning for Bushfire Protection remains unresolved until consultation with the NSW Rural Fire Service has occurred (as recommended below).
	The planning proposal should proceed subject to the following conditions:
	1. Prior to undertaking exhibition, the Project Timeline under Part 6 of the planning
	proposal is to be updated to indicate that the matter will be finalised under Council's delegation.
	2. Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 ("EP&A Act") as follows:
	(a) the planning proposal must be made publicly available for a minimum of 28 days; an
	(b) the relevant planning authority must comply with the notice requirements for public exhibition of planning proposals and the specifications for material that must be made
	publicly available along with planning proposals as identified in section 5.5.2 of A Guide to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning & Infrastructure 2013).
	3. Consultation is required with the NSW Rural Fire Service under section 56(2)(d) of th
	EP&A Act to comply with the requirements of S117 Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire
	Protection. The NSW Rural Fire Service is to be provided with a copy of the planning
	proposal and any relevant supporting material, and given at least 21 days to comment on the proposal.
	4. A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter by any person or body under section 56(2)(e) of the EP&A Act. This does not discharge the relevant planning
	authority from any obligation it may otherwise have to conduct a public hearing (for example, in response to a submission).
	5. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 9 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.
Supporting Reasons :	The reasons for the above recommendations for the planning proposal are as follows:
	1. Permitting detached dual occupancies and secondary dwellings in rural and rural
	residential areas is a matter of local significance.
	2. The proposal is otherwise consistent with all the relevant local and regional planning

2. The proposal is otherwise consistent with all the relevant local and regional planning

Kyogle LEP 2012 – Detached Dual Occupancy and Secondary Dwelling Provisions strategies, contributing to housing choice and affordability throughout the Kyogle LGA. 3. The inconsistency with s117 Direction 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils can be justified as of minor significance. 4. The recommended conditions to the Gateway are required to provide adequate consultation, accountability and progression. Signature: SIM CLARK 10 March 2014 Date: Printed Name:

