

Proposal Title :		Mid-Western Local Environmental Plan 2012 - Various amendments to Lot Size Map, Land Zoning Map and insert new clause for Minimum Lot Size split zones			
Proposal Summ		ltem 1: Amend the minimum lot size on land at Lot 52 DP 633029 Spring Flat Road, Spring Flat from 100Ha to 20Ha to facilitate the subdivision of the land.			at Road, Spring Flat
		Item 2: Rezone land at Lot 76 DP 755434 Adams Lead Road, Gulgong from Zone RU1 Primary Production to Zone R2 Low Density Residential and amend the Lot Size Map from 100Ha to 2Ha.			
	Mudgee from 2	ltem 3: Rezone land at part Lot 41 DP 703056 and part Lot 1 DP 564729 in Market Street, Mudgee from Zone E3 Environmental Management to Zone RE2 Private Recreation and Zone R1 General Residential.			
		Item 4: Insert the standard instrument clause regarding minimum lot sizes for split zoned lots to provide for subdivision of lots that are within more than one zone.			
PP Number :	PP_2014_MID	NR_003_00	Dop File No :	14/19234-1	
Proposal Details					
Date Planning Proposal Receiv	10-Nov-2014 red :		LGA covered :	Mid-Westerr	n Regional
Region :	Western		RPA :	Mid-Westerr	Regional Council
State Electorate	ORANGE		Section of the Act :	55 - Planning	g Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning				
Location Detail	S				
Street :	Spring Flat Road				
Suburb :	Mudgee	City :	Mudgee	Postcode :	2850
Land Parcel :	Lot 52 DP 633029				
Street :	Adams Lead Road				
Suburb :	Gulgong	City :	Gulgong	Postcode :	2852
Land Parcel :	Lot 76 DP 755434				
Street :	Market Street				
Suburb :	Mudgee	City :	Mudgee	Postcode :	2850
Land Parcel :	Part Lot 1 DP 56472	9 and part Lot 41	DP 703056		

DoP Planning Officer Contact Details

Contact Name :	Jessica Holland
Contact Number :	0268412180
Contact Email :	jessica.holland@planning.nsw.gov.au

RPA Contact Details

Contact Name :	Liz Densley
Contact Number :	0263782850
Contact Email :	elizabeth.densley@midwestern.nsw.gov.au

DoP Project Manager Contact Details

Contact Name :	Wayne Garnsey
Contact Number :	0268412180
Contact Email :	wayne.garnsey@planning.nsw.gov.au

Land Release Data

Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :		Consistent with 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) :	3
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?	No		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :			
External Supporting Notes :			

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment : The Planning Proposal clearly states the objective is to rezone and amend the minimum lot size on various parcels of land to permit subdivision and to include a subclause to clarify the minimum lot size for lots that are within more than one zone.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The explanation of provisions states that the objectives of the planning proposal will be achieved by:

Item 1: Amending the minimum lot size on Lot 52 DP 633029 Spring Flat Road, Spring Flat on Lot Size Map LSZ_006 from 100ha to 20Ha.

Item 2: Amending the land use zone on Lot 76 DP 755434 Adams Lead Road, Gulgong on Land Zoning Map LZN_005C from Zone RU1 Primary Production to Zone R2 Low Density Residential and amending the minimum lot size on Lot Size Map LSZ_005C from 100ha to 2Ha.

Item 3: Rezone part Lot 41 DP 703056 and Lot 1 DP 564729 Market Street, Mudgee on Land Zoning Map LZN_006C from Zone E3 Environmental Management to Zone RE2 Private Recreation and Zone R1 General Residential. The planning proposal also intends to amend the minimum lot size on Lot Size Map LSZ_006C to 600 square metres. This is not clearly stated in the Planning Proposal, a condition will be imposed on the Gateway Determination to amend the planning proposal to reflect this prior to public exhibition.

Item 4: Insert a new provision to provide for subdivision of lots that are within more than one zone, but cannot be subdivided under clause 4.1. Council is required to determine the zones to which the clause will apply prior to public exhibition of the planning proposal.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes

b) S.117 directions identifie	d by RPA :	1.2 Rural Zones
* May need the Director Ge	neral's agreement	 1.5 Rural Lands 2.1 Environment Protection Zones 3.1 Residential Zones 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
Is the Director General's	agreement required? Y	es
c) Consistent with Standard	Instrument (LEPs) Orde	er 2006 : Yes
d) Which SEPPs have the F	RPA identified?	SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	SEPP 55 Remediation	n of Land has not been considered in the planning proposal.
Have inconsistencies with it	ems a), b) and d) being	adequately justified? No
If No, explain :	1.2 Rural Zones – Thi within an existing or	is direction applies where a planning proposal will affect land proposed rural zone.
	Item 1: This Direction	is applicable as the Planning Proposal contains a provision that

will increase the permissible denisty of land within a rural zone. The Planning Proposal does not address this Direction. The Item has been assessed as inconsistent with the endorsed Mid-Western Regional Comprehensive Land Use Strategy (CLUS) which does not identify the subject land for rural residential development. Item 1 is inconsistent with the Ministerial Direction and is not supported.

It is recommended that further studies be carried out to strategically justify use of the land and surrounding area for large lot residential development. The Mid-Western Regional Comprehensive Land Use Strategy should be reviewed prior to the consideration of a further amendment to the Mid-Western Regional LEP 2012 which alters a development standard on rural land.

Item 2: The planning proposal states that Item 2 is consistent with the Ministerial Direction as the proposal will permit one additional dwelling on the land and is of minor significance with regard to the agricultural value of rural land. The planning proposal also states that as the proposal affects a single lot, it will not significantly impact or undermine the Mid-Western Regional CLUS.

The planning proposal does not provide strategic justification for the proposals inconsistency with the Mid-Western Regional CLUS. Item 2 is inconsistent with the Ministerial Direction and is not supported.

It is recommended that further studies be carried out to strategically justify use of the land and surrounding area for large lot residential development. The Mid-Western Regional Comprehensive Land Use Strategy should be reviewed prior to the consideration of a further amendment to the Mid-Western Regional LEP 2012 which alters a development standard on rural land.

1.5 Rural Lands – This Direction is applicable to the Planning Proposal as the Planning Proposal affects land within existing rural and environmental protection zones. The planning proposal states that Items 1, 2 and 3 are considered to be of minor significance though the Rural Planning Principles have not been considered and are not addressed.

Items 1 and 2 of the Planning Proposal have been assessed as inconsistent with the Rural Planning Principles and Rural Subdivision Principles. The inconsistency with the Direction has not been adequalty justified. These Items are not supported.

In regard to item 3, the planning proposal affects land within an existing environmental protection zone. The proposed changes to minimum lot size reflect existing land uses and will not reduce the environmental protection of the land. This inconsistency with the Direction is considered minor. This Item is supported.

2.1 Environment Protection Zones – This Direction applies when a planning proposal is prepared. The items within this planning proposal are not located on environmentally sensitive lands and will not reduce the environmental protection standards for the land. The planning proposal is consistent with this Direction.

2.3 Heritage Conservation – This Direction applies when a planning proposal is prepared. Item 3 affects two local heritage items. The planning proposal does not seek to amend the heritage listing, therefore this planning proposal is consistent with this Direction.

4.3 Flood Prone Land – This Direction applies to all relevant planning authorities that are responsible for flood prone land. The Planning Proposal does not address this direction in regard to Items 1 and 2; the subject land is not identified as flood prone. In respect of Item 3, the Planning Proposal states that subject land is not flood prone, however a portion of the land proposed to be zoned RE2 Private Recreation falls within the land identified as flood prone. As the land identified as flood prone is not for

residential or habitable purposes and recreation only, the matter is considered to be of minor significance.

4.4 Bushfire Prone Land – This Direction is applicable where a planning proposal affects land that is identified or is in proximity to land mapped as bushfire prone land. In respect of Items 2 and 3, the Planning Proposal states that the items are not identified as bushfire prone land. The Planning Proposal does not address Item 1 with regard to this Direction. A condition will be imposed on the Gateway Determination to refer the planning proposal to the NSW Rural Fire Service for concurrence.

SEPP 55 Remediation of Land – The planning proposal does not address this SEPP, accordingly it is not known whether the subject land has previoulsy potential contaminated land uses. A condition will be imposed on the Gateway Determination to address SEPP 55 prior to public exhibition.

SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008 – The planning proposal does not address this SEPP. It is considered that Items 1 and 2 are inconsistent with the rural planning principles, specifically with regard to the fragmentation of agricultural land and the consideration of impacts on services and infrastructure. Items 1 and 2 of the Planning Proposal are not supported.

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment :

Adequate locality maps have been provided for the purpose of public exhibition.

Mid-Western Regional Council have requested the Department assist in the production of draft LEP maps consistent with the Department's mapping guidelines. Draft LEP maps will be prepared for submission under Section 59.

The following maps are proposed to be amended:

Item 1:

5270_COM_LSZ_006_160_20140710

Item 2:

5270_COM_LZN_005C_010_20130702 5270_COM_LSZ_005C_010_20140122

Item 3:

5270_COM_LZN_006C_010_20140327 5270_COM_LSZ_006C_010_20140122

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :

Council's proposed community consultation is acceptable. Council intends to public exhibit the planning proposal for a period of 28 days. Council proposes community consultation will include notification on Council's website and local newspaper.

Consultation with the Office of Environment and Heritage will be required as the subject lots of Item 3 are listed as a local heritage item under Schedule 5 of the Mid-Western Regional LEP 2012.

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? No

If No, comment : The proposal is adequate in the information provided.

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

LEP :

Due Date : August 2012

Comments in Mid-Western Regional Local Environmental Plan 2012 was notified on 10 August 2012. relation to Principal

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning Item 1: The planning proposal is required to permit subdivision of the subject land. proposal : Development consent was granted for a two lot subdivision of the land under the previous LEP, the development consent has now lapsed. The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the minimum lot size on the lot from 100 hectares to 40 hectares. The current RU1 Primary Production zoning is proposed to be retained. Sufficient strategic merit for the need for the planning proposal has not been demonstated. This item is not supported.

> Item 2: The planning proposal is required to permit subdivision of the subject land. This item seeks a rezoning from Zone RU1 Primary Production to Zone R2 Low Density Residential and an amendment of the minimum lot size from 100 hectares to 2 hectares. Sufficient strategic merit for the need for the planning proposal has not been demonstated. This Item is not supported.

Item 3: The planning proposal is required to permit subdivision of the subject land and to reserve a portion of land for future recreation uses. This item seeks to rezone a portion of land from Zone E3 Environmental Management to Zone R1 Low Density Residential and an amendment to the minimum lot size from 400 hectares to 600 square metres. A portion of land is also proposed to be rezoned from Zone E3 Environmental Management to Zone RE2 Private Recreation. This Item is supported.

Item 4: The planning proposal is required to clarify the minimum lot size for lots that are within more than one zone, on land in certain zones. This item seeks to include the standard instrument clause, 'Minimum lot sizes for certain split zones'. This Item is supported.

ing map and moor		nimum Lot Size split zones	
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	Items 1 and 2 of the planning proposal are inconsistent with the endorsed Mid-Western Regional Comprehensive Land Use Strategy (CLUS), which was used in the preparation of the Mid-Western Regional LEP 2012.		
	potential. These area 2 were not considered the future developm amendment is not co of the CLUS. The Pla	several precincts for short, medium an as were identified based on constraints ed as part of these considerations and ent opportunity areas. As these propos onsidered to impact significantly on the anning Proposal is however inconsister oportunity areas for future development	and opportunities. Items 1 and were not identified as part of als are isolated in nature, the e demand and supply outcomes it with the objective of the
	additional land for re Use Strategy should	hat further studies be carried out to stra esidential purposes. The Mid-Western F be reviewed prior to consideration of a al LEP 2012 which alter the provisions	Regional Comprehensive Land any further amendments to the
	land use. The propos	ne land within an existing residential pr sed minimum lot size amendment from t with the Mid-Western Regional CLUS eral Residential.	400 hectares to 600 square
	As proposed, the amendment would result in an isolated portion of land zoned E3 Environmental Management surrounded by land in Zone R1 General Residential. This portion of land is currently occupied by a residential dwelling, it is considered appropriate to zone the land Zone R1 General Residential as part of this amendment. A condition will be imposed on the Gateway Determination to this effect.		
		fy the minimum lot size for lots within n jic planning framework.	nore than one zone and is not
Environmental social economic impacts :	The planning propos	al states that impacts will be negligible	».
		nsidered to have environmental and so icultural land. These Items are inconsis are not supported.	• • • •
Item 3 is not considered to have environmental, social or economic impacts as t proposal seeks to reflect the existing use of the land.		conomic impacts as the	
		iy a matter relating to minimum lot size: environmental, social or economic imp	
ssessment Proces	38		
Proposal type :		Community Consultation Period :	28 Days
Timeframe to make _EP :	9 months	Delegation :	RPA
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)			

Mid-Western Local Environmental Plan 2012 - Various amendments to Lot Size Map, Land Zoning Map and insert new clause for Minimum Lot Size split zones Is Public Hearing by the PAC required? No (2)(a) Should the matter proceed ? Yes If no, provide reasons : Items 1 and 2 are not recommended to proceed. Items 3 and 4 are supported. The Planning Proposal does not demonstrate strategic merit for Items 1 and 2. These items are inconsistent with the endorsed Mid-Western Regional Comprehensive Land Use Strategy 2010, used to prepare the Mid-Western Regional LEP 2012. This item is inconsistent with MinIsterial Directions 1.2 Rural Zones, 1.5 Rural Lands and SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008. It is recommended Council carry out further studies to identify the suitability of the localities for rural residential development. Particulary in respect of Item 1 given the sites location, adjacent to an identified future development opportunity area. Any future amendments should be considered as part of a review of the Mid-Western Regional Comprehensive Land Use Strategy (CLUS) and a subsequent planning proposal, if determined suitable. In respect of Item 2, Council identified Zone R2 Low Density Residential as a prefered land use zone for to facilitate the intent of the amendment without permitting detached dual occupancies. It is considered that the zone objectives of Zone R2 Low Density Residential are not appropriate on the subject land given its setting. It is suggested that once strategically justified the intent of the proposal could be achieved through Schedule 1 Additional Permitted Uses to permit a lot size of 2 hectares whilst retaining the existing Zone RU1 Primary Production. Further, the permitted land uses and objectives of Zone R5 Large Lot Residential are consistent with the expected future intended use of the subject land and could be considered with a minimum lot size of 2ha. Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required. If Other, provide reasons : Identify any internal consultations, if required : No internal consultation required

Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No

If Yes, reasons :

Documents

Document F	ile Name
------------	----------

DocumentType Name

Is Public

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
 2.1 Environment Protection Zones
 3.1 Residential Zones

Mid-Western Local Environmental Plan 2012 - Various amendments to Lot Size Map, Land Zoning Map and insert new clause for Minimum Lot Size split zones 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Additional Information 1) Items 1 and 2 are not to proceed for the following reasons: - Inconsistent with the Mid-Western Regional Comprehensive Land Use Strategy; - Inconsistent with Section 117 Directions 1.2 Rural Zones and 1.5 Rural Lands, and - Inconsistent with State Environment Planning Policy (Rural Lands) 2008. The following conditions relate to Items 3 and 4 of the Planning Proposal. 2. Prior to undertaking public exhibition, Council is to amend the Planning Proposal: a) to remove Items 1 and 2 from the Planning Proposal, b) to address State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) 55 Remediation of Land, c) to outline the zones which are to be affected by the minimum lot size for split zones provision. d) to clearly indicate the intent to amend the minimum lot size on part Lot 41 DP 703056 and Lot 1 DP 564729 Market Street, Mudgee to 600 square metres, and e) to zone land that forms part Lot 42 DP 703056 within Zone E3 Environmental Management, Zone R1 General Residential and amend the minimum lot size to 600 square metres. The Planning Proposal is not to be placed on public exhibition until the Department is satisfied that the above amendments have been adequately addressed. 3. 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; and (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 and Infrastructure 2013). 4. Consultation is required with the following public authority under section 56(2)(d) of the EP&A Act and/or comply with the requirements of relevant S117 Directions: Office of Environment and Heritage 5. 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 Council from any obligation it may otherwise have to conduct a public hearing (for example, in response to a submission or if reclassifying land). 6. Prior to submission of the Planning Proposal under section 59 of the EP&A Act a Land Zoning Map and Lot Size Map that applies to the subject land is to be prepared compliant with the Department's 'Standard technical requirements for LEP maps'. 7. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 9 months from the week following the date of the Gateway Determination. Supporting Reasons : Items 1 and 2 are inconsistent with the Mid-Western Regional Comprehensive Land Use Study, Ministerial Directions 1.2 Rural Zones and 1.5 Rural Lands, SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008 and demonstrate no strategic merit. These Items are not supported. Item 3 of the planning proposal seeks to rezone land from Zone E3 Environmental Management to Zone R1 General Residential, which reflects the existing uses on the land. The proposed minimum lot size amendment from 400 hectares to 600 square metres is consistent with the surrounding area and the current provisions for Zone R1 General Residential

Mid-Western Local Environmental Plan 2012 - Various amendments to Lot Size Map, Land Zoning Map and insert new clause for Minimum Lot Size split zones		
	Item 4 seeks to include provisions to clarify the minimum lot size for lots that are within more than one zone, on land within certain zones by insertion of a Standard Instrument clause.	
Signature:	Alland	
Printed Name:	Jessica Holland Date: 8 December 2014	