

# **COROWA LEP 2012 – Amendment 3**

## **Part 1 – Objectives or Intended Outcomes**

The intended outcome for the Planning Proposal is to:-

- To correct a mapping error that applies to part of land at Lot 11 DP 737090 – land that is currently zoned W2- Recreational Waterways to be zoned R1- General Residential i.e. land that is north of the foreshore/retaining wall.
- To correct a mapping error that applies to part of land at Lot 12 DP 737090 – land that is currently zoned W2- Recreational Waterway to be zoned R1-General residential i.e. land that is north of the foreshore/retaining wall.

## **Part 2 – Explanation of Provisions**

In relation to items 1 and 2 above will entail amendments to the relevant land zoning, lot size, height of buildings and riverfront building line maps and the map cover sheet.

Refer to the maps that accompany this Planning Proposal

The draft maps provided comply with the Technical Guidelines.

## **Part 3 – Justification**

### **Section A – Need for the planning proposal**

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

The planning proposal is to correct a mapping error. Land that is north of the foreshore and retaining wall that is above the 1% flood level has been mapped as W2 Recreational Waterways instead of R1 General Residential.

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

The planning proposal is the best means to achieve the proposed outcomes as the identified land requires rezoning to correct the error.

- 3 Is there a net community benefit?

While not quantified there will be net community benefit realised in that a mapping error will be corrected and land use restored which will allow future development.

### **Section B – Relationship to strategic planning framework**

- 4 Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions contained within the applicable **regional or sub-regional strategy** (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?

There is no regional or sub-regional strategy applicable to the subject lands. The draft Murray Regional Strategy is being prepared and the proposal is not inconsistent with this as it relates to relatively minor changes to local planning in urban areas.

- 5 Is the planning proposal consistent with the local council's **Community Strategic Plan**, or other **local strategic plan**?

The proposal is not consistent with the approved Corowa Strategic Land Use Plan and can be considered as minor. This is where the original mapping error occurred with the land being identified as environmentally sensitive rather than residential. The land is occupied by 2 dwellings a motel (64 units) and associated wellness buildings.

- 6 Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable **state environmental planning policies**?

Yes – refer to assessment in **Attachment B**

- 7 Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable **Ministerial Directions** (s. 117 direction)?

Yes – refer to assessment in **Attachment C**.

## **Section C – Environmental, social and economic impact**

- 8 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 – the lands north of the foreshore/retaining wall are occupied by 2 dwellings, a motel (64 units) and associated wellness building and are general clear and free of constraint and suitable for the proposed rezoning and is part of the urban area. The southern portion of the lands i.e. south of the foreshore/retaining wall forms part of Lake Mulwala. The area of lands south of the foreshore/retaining wall will remain W2 Recreational Waterways. Consultation will occur with agencies to ascertain if there are any significant species, communities or habitats.

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

No – there are no known environmental effects. Both lots are connected to existing utilities i.e. sewer, water and electricity. Portions of lands north of the foreshore/retaining wall are above the 1% flood level. Consultation will occur with agencies to ascertain if there are any significant constraints.

- 10 How has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?

The proposal will provide residential development opportunities on lands suitable for such use which have social and economic benefits.

## **Section D – State and Commonwealth interests**

11 Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

Yes – the identified lands are adequately serviced by local services to cater for the existing and future development.

12 What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the gateway determination, and have they resulted in any variations to the planning proposal?

No consultation has occurred at this stage. Consultation with the state government agencies will be undertaken post gateway determination.

It is proposed to consult with the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, Office of Water, Roads and Maritime Services, primary Industries – Fisheries, Environmental protection Authority and Murray-Darling Basin Authority.

There is no Commonwealth land involved and there is no reason to consult with Commonwealth agencies in this case.

## **Section E – Reclassification of Public Land**

There is no public land identified and therefore this section is not applicable.

## **Part 4 – Mapping**

Both lands are subject to two zonings i.e. R1 General Residential and W2 Recreational Waterways. The zoning boundaries are on the northern portion of both lots. The planning proposal will amend the common zone boundary to the southern portion of the lots i.e. foreshore/retaining wall. See attached maps indicating current and proposed zones.

## **Part 5 – Community Consultation**

It is considered that the planning proposal is routine and it is proposed to consult with the community for 14 days and complete the proposal in 12 months.

## **Part 6 – Project timetable**

- The plan will be made within 12 months of the Gateway Determination date.
- The planning proposal will be exhibited within 4 weeks of the Gateway Determination date.
- Community Consultation will be completed 28 days from the last day the Planning Proposal must be exhibited.
- Public Authority Consultation will be completed within 35 days of the Gateway Determination date.
- The RPA will request the Department to draft and finalise the LEP no later than 6 weeks prior to the projected making of the plan date specified in the first dot point.