

Planning Proposal

Amendments to Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010 and Council's draft Heritage Local Environmental Plan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Intro | Introduction3 | | | |
|-------|---------------|--|------------|--|
| Part | 2 – | Objectives or Intended Outcomes Explanation of Provisions Justification | 3 | |
| | Sect | tion A – Need for the Planning Proposal | 23 | |
| | 1. | Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report? | 23 | |
| | 2. | Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is their a better way? | 23 | |
| | 3. | Is there a net community benefit? | 23 | |
| | Sect | tion B – Relationship to strategic planning framework | 24 | |
| | 4. | Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions container within the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)? | / | |
| | 5. | Is the planning proposal consistent with the local council's Community Strategic Plan, or other local strategic plan? | 24 | |
| | 6. | Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable state environmental planning policies? | 24 | |
| | 7. | Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)? | <u>2</u> 4 | |
| | Sect | tion C – Environmental, social and economic impact | 27 | |
| | 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? | | |
| | 9. | Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed? | 27 | |
| | 10. | How has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects? | 27 | |
| | Sect | tion D – State and Commonwealth interests | 27 | |
| | 11. | Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal? | 27 | |
| | 12. | What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulter in accordance with the gateway determination? | | |
| Part | 4 – | Community Consultation | 29 | |

Introduction

This Planning Proposal has been prepared in accordance with section 55 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (the Act) and relevant Department of Planning and Infrastructure guidelines including "*A Guide to Preparing Local Environmental Plans*" and "*A Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals*".

The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has issued a Gateway Determination under section 56 of the Act. This Determination allows Council to proceed with the Planning Proposal.

Part 1 – Objectives or Intended Outcomes

The objectives of this Planning Proposal are:

- 1. To clarify the relationship between *Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010* and *Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No.25 Orchard Hills*;
- 2. To clarify the minimum lot size requirements in *Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010* when land is subdivided under a community title scheme;
- 3. To retain the prohibition on secondary dwellings in the Twin Creeks estate under *Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010* following an amendment to the definition of secondary dwelling under the *Standard Instrument (Local Environmental Plans) Amendment Order 2011*;
- 4. To replace Clause 6.14 (Development of land in the flight paths of the site reserved for the proposed Second Sydney Airport) of *Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010*, excluding the title, objectives and the definition of ANEF, with the model local provision 7.6 (Development in areas subject to aircraft noise), excluding the title, objectives and the definition of ANEF contour);
- 5. To address various minor discrepancies relating to a flood planning term, land use terms, Schedules 1, 2 and 5, and the clause application, land zoning, lot size and heritage maps for *Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010*; and
- 6. To transfer the listing for the adopted heritage item on land known as 1 Bundarra Road, Regentville, from *Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010* to Council's draft Heritage Local Environmental Plan.

Part 2 – Explanation of Provisions

A number of amendments are proposed to *Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010* (LEP 2010) and are described below:

| No. | Amendment: | Explanation of provision: |
|-------|---|---|
| Claus | es | |
| 1. | Add New Subclause to Clause 1.9 Application of SEPPs: Insert the following at the end of clause 1.9(2): Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No 25 – Orchard Hills | Following the publication of LEP 2010, it was intended that all land within <i>Sydney</i> <i>Regional Environmental Plan No.25 –</i> <i>Orchard Hills</i> (SREP 25), with the exception of one site, would be subject to the provisions of LEP 2010. The exception is a site, known as "The |

| No. | Amendment: | Explanation of provision: |
|-----|--|--|
| | | Knoll", being part of Lot 21, DP 1151724, Nos.17-53 Caddens Road, Kingswood and identified as a deferred matter on Tile 13 of the Land Zoning Map. |
| | | As SREP 25 was to only apply to this one site, it was not repealed. Council's legal advice indicates that the consequence of not repealing SREP 25 is that it continues to apply to all land in Orchard Hills and prevails in the event of an inconsistency between SREP 25 and LEP 2010. |
| | | A new subclause is to be inserted in LEP 2010 to clearly indicate that SREP 25 does not apply to any land in LEP 2010 with the exception of the one site referred to above. |
| | | The maps in Appendix 1 identify the existing and proposed boundary of the application of SREP 25. |
| 2. | Add New Clause: 4.1AA Minimum subdivision lot size for community titles schemes | The Department has advised Council that the effect of clause 4.1(4) of LEP 2010 is "that the Minimum Lot Size Map does not |
| | (1) The objectives of this clause are as follows: (a) to ensure that subdivisions under community title schemes maintain minimum lot sizes, | apply to land that is subdivided under a strata plan or community title scheme". This means that land, including land zoned for rural or environmental purposes in LEP 2010, may be subdivided into lots less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map where those lots are proposed in a |
| | | |
| | (b) to ensure that lot sizes are compatible with the environmental capabilities of the land, and the character | community title scheme. This was not the intent of the subdivision provisions of LEP 2010, particularly in rural and environmental zones. |
| | and density of development in the area, (c) to ensure that lot sizes and | A new clause is to be inserted in LEP 2010 to ensure that land subdivided under a community title scheme does not result in |
| | dimensions allow developments to be sited to protect natural or cultural features and to have a minimal impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. | lots that are less than the minimum lot size shown on the Lot Size Map for that land. The new clause is the same as 'Clause 4.1AA Minimum subdivision lot size for community titles schemes' of the Standard Instrument (Local Environmental Plans) Amendment Order 2011 published on 25 |
| | (2) This clause applies to a | |

| No. | Amendment: | Explanation of provision: | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| | subdivision of land (being land under a community title scheme and shown on the Lot Size Map) that requires development consent and is carried out after the commencement of this Plan. Note. Part 6 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Development) Codes 2008 provides that the strata subdivision of a building in certain circumstances is specified as complying development. (3) The size of any lot resulting from a subdivision of land to which this clause applies (other than any lot comprising association property within the meaning of the Community Land Development Act 1989) is not to be less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map in relation to that land. Direction. An exception to the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map may be provided in certain circumstances, for example, in the case of land that is to be used for attached dwellings. | February 2011. The objectives of the new clause seek to ensure that subdivision of land under a community title scheme does not undermine the objectives of clause 4.1 Minimum subdivision lot size of LEP 2010 and a consistent approach is applied to subdivisions. | |
| 3. | Amend Subclause (4) of Clause 6.12 <u>Twin Creeks:</u> Amend to: Despite any other provision of this Plan, development consent must not be granted for a dual occupancy or secondary dwelling on a lot to which this clause applies. | The Standard Instrument (Local Environmental Plans) Amendment Order 2011, published on 25 February 2011, amends the definition of secondary dwelling to allow them on "an individual lot in a community title scheme". The amendment means that a secondary dwelling would become a permissible use on each individual lot in the Twin Creeks estate. Subclause 6.12(4) currently places limits on the number of lots in the Twin Creeks estate and prohibits <i>dual occupancies</i> . These controls are in place to ensure that development does not deviate from the adopted Master Plan for the estate, which | |

| Amend Clause 6.14 Development of land in the flight paths of the site reserved for the proposed Second Sydney Airport: Amend to: 6.14 Development of land in the flight paths of the site reserved for the proposed Second Sydney Airport: Amend to: 6.14 Development of land in the flight paths of the site reserved for the proposed Second Sydney Airport: (1) The objective of this clause is to ensure that development in the vicinity of the proposed Badgery's Creek airport site: (a) has regard to the use or potential future use of the site as an airport, and (b) does not hinder or have any other adverse impact on the development or paration the that: | No. | Amendment: | Explanation of provision: |
|---|-----|--|---|
| in the flight paths of the site reserved for the proposed Second Sydney Airport: Amend to: 6.14 Development of land in the flight paths of the site reserved for the proposed Second Sydney Airport (1) The objective of this clause is to ensure that development in the vicinity of the proposed Badgery's Creek airport site: (a) has regard to the use or potential future use of the site as an airport, and (b) does not hinder or have any other adverse impact on that site. (b) does not hinder or have any other adverse impact on that site. (c) This clause applies to development that: (a) is on land that: (i) is near the proposed Badgery's Creek airport site: (a) is on land that: (ii) is near the proposed Badgery's Creek airport site, and (iii) is in an ANEF contour of 20 | | | controls are also in place to ensure that development does not unreasonably increase the need for further services and facilities, including for sewage management. To ensure that secondary dwellings continue to be prohibited in the Twin Creeks estate under LEP 2010, and the density and character of the estate are maintained, it is intended to amend clause 6.12(4) to include |
| or greater, and (b) the consent authority considers | 4. | in the flight paths of the site reserved for the proposed Second Sydney Airport: Amend to: 6.14 Development of land in the flight paths of the site reserved for the proposed Second Sydney Airport (1) The objective of this clause is to ensure that development in the vicinity of the proposed Badgery's Creek airport site: (a) has regard to the use or potential future use of the site as an airport, and (b) does not hinder or have any other adverse impact on the development or operation of the airport on that site. (2) This clause applies to development that: (a) is on land that: (i) is near the proposed Badgery's Creek airport site, and (ii) is in an ANEF contour of 20 or greater, and | at a Federal Government level indicating that Badgerys Creek is not the preferred site for a second airport in Sydney and concerns regarding the costs involved in undertaking an acoustic report as part of a development application, the Department has advised that clause 6.14 is still deemed applicable in accordance with Section 117 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment</i> <i>Act 1979</i>. The clause is proposed to be amended to make it more consistent with the Department's model local provision for aircraft noise (7.6) and to provide some flexibility to Council when assessing applications affected by the clause. Appendix 2 provides the Noise Exposure Forecast map as shown in Appendix U of the draft environmental impact statement for the Second Sydney Airport. The Noise Exposure Forecast map has been translated to an 'Airport Noise Map', also included in Appendix 2, to clearly identify the land to which this clause |

| No. | Amendment: | Explanation of provision: |
|-----|---|---------------------------|
| | is likely to be adversely affected by aircraft noise. | |
| | (3) Before determining a development application for development to which this clause applies, the consent authority: | |
| | (a) must consider whether the development will result in an increase in the number of dwellings or people affected by aircraft noise, and | |
| | (b) must consider the location of the development in relation to the criteria set out in Table 2.1 (Building Site Acceptability Based on ANEF Zones) in AS 2021-2000, Acoustics - Aircraft noise intrusion – Building siting and construction, and | |
| | (c) must be satisfied that the development will meet AS 2021-2000, Acoustics - Aircraft noise intrusion – Building siting and construction with respect to interior noise levels for the purposes of: | |
| | (i) if the development will be in an ANEF contour or 20 or greater – child care centres, educational establishments, entertainment facilities, hospitals, places of public worship, public administration buildings or residential accommodation, and | |
| | (ii) if the development will be in an ANEF contour of 25 or greater – business premises, hostels, hotel or motel accommodation, office premises or retail premises. | |
| | (4) In this clause: | |
| | airport means civil, military or joint | |

| No. | Amendment: | Explanation of provision: |
|-------|---|---|
| | civil and military airport. ANEF means Australian Noise Exposure Forecast contour line shown on the map in Appendix U of the draft environmental impact statement for the Second Sydney Airport, copies of which are deposited in the office of the Council and of the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government. | |
| 5.(a) | <u>Amend Clause 6.3 Flood Planning</u> : The reference to average <i>recurrent</i> <i>interval</i> is to be corrected to <i>average</i> <i>recurrence interval</i> in subclause (7). | This amendment is to clarify the definition of <i>flood planning level.</i> This amendment ensures that the clause is consistent with the NSW Government's <i>Floodplain Development Manual</i> published in 2005. |
| Land | Use Table | |
| 5.(b) | RU1 Primary Production (3) – remove the term <i>Turf farming</i> | It is intended to continue to permit turf farming with consent in Zone RU1, but remove the term <i>Turf farming</i> as it is part of the group term <i>Agriculture</i> . |
| 5.(c) | RU4 Primary Production Small Lots (3) – remove the term <i>Horticulture</i> | It is intended to continue to permit horticulture with consent in Zone RU4, but remove the term <i>Horticulture</i> as it is part of the group term <i>Agriculture</i> . |
| 5.(d) | RE1 Public Recreation (4) – remove the term <i>Retail premises</i> | It is intended to remove <i>Retail premises</i> as it is not a term mandated in the Standard Instrument and is captured by <i>Any other</i> <i>development nor specified in item 2 or 3.</i> |
| Sched | lules | |
| 5.(e) | Schedule 1 – Item 5(1) to read: " being Lot 23, DP 1142130". | The property description is to be updated following a consolidation of the lots. |
| 5.(f) | Schedule 2 – Signage (building identification signs) (1) – amend <i>30m</i> ² to | It is intended to insert a missing decimal point in (1) to ensure that the maximum |

| No. | Amendment: | Explanation of provision: | |
|-------|--|---|--|
| | 3.0m². | area of a building identification sign under exempt development provisions is <i>3.0m</i> ² not <i>30m</i> ² . | |
| 5.(g) | Schedule 5 – Item No. 2260261C (Castlereagh Road) – amend Castlereagh Road to Castlereagh Road Alignment and amend State to Local. | The heritage significance of the item is to be corrected to <i>Local</i> significance as the item is not listed on the State Heritage Register. The item name is to be corrected to <i>Castlereagh Road Alignment</i> , consistent with Item No. 2260261A. | |
| 5.(h) | Schedule 5 – (Luddenham Road) – amend Luddenham Road to Luddenham Road Alignment and insert Local and 2260843. | The item name is to be corrected to <i>Luddenham Road Alignment</i> . The significance is to be listed as <i>Local</i> . The item number is to be inserted as 2260843. | |
| 5.(i) | Schedule 5 – Item No. 2260844 (Former Mulgoa Road Alignment) - amend <i>State</i> to <i>Local.</i> | The heritage significance of the item is to be corrected to <i>Local</i> significance as the item is not listed on the State Heritage Register. | |
| 5.(j) | Schedule 5 – Item No. 2260126 (St Thomas' Anglican Church & Cemetery) – add and Lot 1, DP 1035490. | The property description is to be expanded to Lot 1, DP 996994 and Lot 1, DP 1035490. | |
| 5.(k) | Schedule 5 – Item No. 2260138 (Winbourne) – amend 43-119 St Thomas Road to 1315 Mulgoa Road and Lot 1, DP 996994; Lot 1, DP 1035490 to Lot 4, DP 854076. | The address is to be corrected to <i>1315</i> <i>Mulgoa Road.</i> The property description is to be corrected to <i>Lot 4, DP 854076.</i> | |
| 5.(I) | Schedule 5 – Item No. 2260125 (The Cottage) – add and 2-24 St Thomas Road and amend Lots 3-4, DP 241971 to Lots 2, 3 & 4 DP 241971. | The address is to be expanded to 1012- 1046 Mulgoa Road and 2-24 St Thomas Road. The property description is to be corrected to Lots 2, 3 & 4 DP 241971. | |
| 5.(m) | Schedule 5 – Item No. 2260276 (Regentville Workers' Terrace) – remove this item. | The item is to be removed from LEP 2010 as it is located outside of the land identified on the Land Application Map. It is to be transferred to a suitable planning instrument | |

| No. | Amendment: | Explanation of provision: | |
|-------|---|---|--|
| | | that applies to that land. | |
| LEP N | laps | | |
| 5.(n) | Clause Application Map – 6350_COM_CAP_002_080_20100721 – remove <i>Waterside Corporate</i> label. | The <i>Waterside Corporate</i> label in the grey area, as shown in Figure 1 , is to be removed as it is unnecessary. | |
| 5.(0) | Land Zoning Map – 6350_COM_LZN_006_020_20100616 – amend SP2 Classified road and SP2 Local road labels. | The SP2 Classified road label along Mulgoa Road, Jamisontown, as shown in Figure 2 , is to be amended to SP2 Local road. The SP2 Local road label along Mulgoa Road, Jamisontown, as shown in Figure 2 , is to be amended to SP2 Classified road. | |
| 5.(p) | Land Zoning Map – 6350_COM_LZN_013_020_20100625 – amend boundaries of deferred matters. | The boundary of the deferred matter in the vicinity of the Great Western Highway, as shown in Figure 3 , is to be moved to include Market Street. The zones for the deferred matter are included in the draft Planning Proposal for Stage 2 of the Penrith City-wide LEP. | |
| | | Further, the extent of the deferred matter to the north of Caddens Road, as shown in Figure 4 , is to be reduced to only that area within the boundaries of SREP 25. The zone for the deferred matter is included in the Planning Proposal for Stage 2 of the Penrith City-wide LEP. | |
| 5.(q) | Land Zoning Map – 6350_COM_LZN_019_020_20100616 – amend E2 zone boundary. | The boundary of the E2 zone in the vicinity of Barker and Hall Streets, St Marys, as shown in Figure 5 , is to be amended to correspond with the boundary of the deferred matter. | |
| 5.(r) | Land Zoning Map – 6350_COM_LZN_021_020_20100423 – extend E2 zone boundary. | The E2 zone along the road reserve to the west of Clifton Avenue, Kemps Creek, as shown in Figure 6 , is to be extended to include all of the road reserve to Clifton Avenue. | |
| 5.(s) | Lot Size Map – 6350_COM_LSZ_011_020_20100511 – | The Lot Size Map is to be amended, as shown in Figure 7 , to indicate that the small | |

| No. | Amendment: | Explanation of provision: |
|-------|---|--|
| | amend 'AB3' to 'Z'. | triangle of land within Lot 2 DP 11707 (39 Smeeton Road, Londonderry) is shown as 'Z' (with minimum lot size of 2ha), instead of 'AB3' (with minimum lot size of 40ha). |
| | | The subject property has an area of approximately 8.4 hectares and is zoned mostly RU4 Primary Production Small Lots with a minimum lot size control of 2ha, with the remainder zoned part SP2 Infrastructure (Future Road) and part E2 Environmental Conservation. The portion of the property zoned E2 is part of the riparian corridor that extends along Rickabys Creek and currently has a minimum lot size control of 40ha. |
| | | Following the exhibition of LEP 2010 (as draft Penrith LEP 2008), Council resolved to "amend the minimum lot size map along riparian/biodiversity corridors to reflect the minimum lot size of the adjoining land". This was to overcome the unintended complexity of determining which lot size applied when considering the subdivision of land along riparian/biodiversity corridors. |
| | | While the lot size map was amended accordingly, this particular site was missed. This amendment corrects this error. |
| 5.(t) | Heritage Map – 6350_COM_HER_005_020_20100723 – amend 2260261 label to 2260261C. | The label on heritage item 2260261 (Castlereagh Road, Castlereagh), as shown in Figure 8 , is to be amended to 2260261C consistent with the written instrument. |
| 5.(u) | Land Reservation Acquisition Map - 6350_COM_LRA_006_020_20100512 - amend <i>Classified Road (SP2)</i> and <i>Local</i> <i>Road (SP2)</i> labels. | The <i>Classified Road (SP2)</i> label along Mulgoa Road, Jamisontown, as shown in Figure 9 , is to be amended to <i>Local Road</i> <i>(SP2).</i> |
| | | The <i>Local Road (SP2)</i> label along Mulgoa Road, Jamisontown, as shown in Figure 9 , is to be amended to <i>Classified Road (SP2)</i> . |

Two amendments are proposed to Council's draft Heritage Local Environmental Plan (the draft Heritage LEP) and are described below. The draft Heritage LEP was submitted to the Department in December 2009 with a request that the Minister make the plan. It is expected to be finalised shortly.

| No. | Amendment: | Explanation of provision: | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sche | Schedules | | | | |
| 6.(a) | Schedule 1 – Add <i>Regentville Workers'</i> <i>Terrace</i> as a new heritage item. | This item is to be included in the draft Heritage LEP as it is located within the land identified on the Land Application Map for that LEP. | | | |
| | | The suburb is Regentville. | | | |
| | | The item name is <i>Regentville Workers'</i> <i>Terrace.</i> | | | |
| | | The address is 1 Bundarra Road. | | | |
| | | The property description is <i>Lots 1, 2 and 19, DP 165400.</i> | | | |
| | | The significance is <i>Local</i> . | | | |
| | | The item number is <i>I</i> 2260276. | | | |
| LEP I | LEP Maps | | | | |
| 6.(b) | Heritage Map – Include the above item on the Heritage Map. | The above item is to be included on Tile No.6 of the Heritage Map as <i>I2260276.</i> See Figure 10 . | | | |





















Part 3 – Justification

Section A – Need for the Planning Proposal

1. 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. The amendments included in this Planning Proposal have been identified primarily by Council staff, as well as other stakeholders, following publication and initial implementation of LEP 2010. The amendments are considered to be minor in nature.

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

The main objective of this Planning Proposal is to ensure that the intent of LEP 2010 is achieved by clarifying the relationship between LEP 2010 and SREP 25, clarifying the minimum subdivision lot size requirements when land is subdivided under a community title scheme, and retaining the prohibition on secondary dwellings in the Twin Creeks estate. The Planning Proposal will also amend the clause in LEP 2010 relating to development in the flight paths of the proposed Second Sydney Airport to ensure it is more consistent with the Department's model local provision. In addition, the opportunity has been taken to address various minor discrepancies to ensure the written instrument and maps for LEP 2010 and the draft Heritage LEP are accurate. Council, in consultation with the Department of Planning and Infrastructure's regional team, considers that this Planning Proposal is the most appropriate and timely way of achieving these outcomes.

3. Is there a net community benefit?

The Planning Proposal will clarify which land is subject to LEP 2010 and which is subject to SREP 25. It will also clarify the requirements for minimum subdivision lot sizes, where land is proposed to be subdivided under a community title scheme. This will ensure that the land is not fragmented and the character and density of development within an area are retained. It will also ensure a consistent approach to the subdivision of land. Further, the Planning Proposal will retain the prohibition on secondary dwellings in the Twin Creeks estate to ensure its character and density are maintained. All of these amendments will result in a net community benefit by providing certainty to landowners, the community and proponents.

The amendment to the clause relating to development in the flight paths of the proposed Second Sydney Airport will provide some flexibility to Council when assessing applications affected by this clause, particularly given announcements at a Federal Government level indicating that Badgerys Creek is not the preferred site for an airport. This will have benefits for the community potentially affected.

The remaining amendments in the Planning Proposal will ensure that LEP 2010 and the draft Heritage LEP are accurate. They will also result in a net community benefit by providing certainty to landowners, the community and proponents.

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)?

The Planning Proposal is consistent with the objectives and actions in the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 and the draft North West Subregional Strategy.

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

The Planning Proposal is consistent with Penrith's Community Strategic Plan, *Penrith Regional City Strategic Plan 2031*.

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

The Planning Proposal is consistent with the applicable state environmental planning policies.

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

The Planning Proposal is consistent with the following applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions):

| Ministerial Direction | | Objective | Consistency | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| 1. Employment and Resources | | | | |
| 1.2 | Rural Zones | The objective of this direction is to protect the agricultural production value of rural land. | Y | The Planning Proposal is consistent with this direction. The proposed clause on 'minimum subdivision lot size for community title scheme' is to ensure land is not fragmented by subdivision and the character and density of development within an area are retained. |
| 2. E | nvironment and I | leritage | | |
| 2.1 | Environment Protection Zones | The objective of this direction is to protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas. | Y | The Planning Proposal is consistent with this direction and does not reduce any environmental protection standards that apply to the land. The amendment to Clause 6.12 Twin Creeks will retain the prohibition on secondary dwellings in the E4 zone in Twin Creeks ensuring its character and density are maintained. |
| 2.3 | Heritage Conservation | The objective of this direction is to conserve items, areas, objects | Y | The Planning Proposal is consistent with this direction as it proposes to amend the Heritage Schedules and |

| Ministerial Direction | | Objective | Consistency | |
|-----------------------|--|--|-------------|---|
| | | and places of environmental heritage significance and indigenous heritage significance. | | Maps for both LEP 2010 and the draft Heritage LEP to ensure heritage items are identified accurately. |
| 2.4 | Recreation Vehicle Areas | The objective of this direction is to protect sensitive land or land with significant conservation values from adverse impacts from recreation vehicles. | Y | The Planning Proposal does not enable land to be developed for the purpose of a recreation vehicle area. |
| 3. H | ousing, Infrastrue | cture and Urban Develop | oment | |
| 3.2 | Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates | The objectives of this direction are: to provide for a variety of housing types, and to provide opportunities for caravan parks and manufactured home estates. | Y | The Planning Proposal does not alter any provisions relating to caravan parks and manufactured home estates. |
| 3.3 | Home Occupations | The objective of this direction is to encourage the carrying out of low-impact small businesses in dwelling houses. | Y | The Planning Proposal does not alter any provisions relating to home occupations. |
| 4. H | azard and Risk | | | |
| 4.3 | Flood Prone Land | The objectives of this direction are: to ensure that development of flood prone land is consistent with the NSW Government's Flood Prone Land Policy and the principles of the <i>Floodplain Development Manual 2005</i>, and to ensure that the provisions of an LEP on flood prone land is | Y | The Planning Proposal is consistent with this direction and proposes to correct the reference to average recurrent interval to average recurrence interval. |

| Ministerial Direction | | Objective | Consistency | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|-------------|---|--|
| | | commensurate with flood hazard and includes consideration of the potential flood impacts both on and off the subject land. | | | |
| 4.4 | Planning for Bushfire Protection | The objectives of this direction are: to protect life, property and the environment from bush fire hazards, by discouraging the establishment of incompatible land uses in bush fire prone areas, and to encourage sound management of bush fire prone areas. | Y | The Planning Proposal does not alter any provisions relating to bushfire protection. | |
| 5. R | egional Planning | | | | |
| 5.8 | Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek | The objective of this direction is to avoid incompatible development in the vicinity of any future second Sydney Airport at Badgerys Creek. | Y | The Planning Proposal does not contain provisions that could hinder the potential for development of a Second Sydney Airport. Clause 6.14 is to be amended to provide some flexibility to Council when assessing applications affected by this clause, in light of recent Federal Government announcements. | |
| 6. L | ocal Plan Making | | | | |
| 6.1 | Approval and Referral Requirements | The objective of this direction is to ensure that LEP provisions encourage the efficient and appropriate assessment of development. | Y | The Planning Proposal is consistent with this direction and does not alter any concurrence, consultation or referral requirements. | |
| 6.2 | Reserving Land for Public Purposes | The objectives of this direction are: to facilitate the provision of public services and facilities by | Y | The Planning Proposal does not alter any provisions relating to the zoning or reservation of land for public purposes. | |

| Ministerial Direction | | Objective | Consistency | |
|-----------------------|--|--|-------------|---|
| | | reserving land for public purposes, and | | |
| | | to facilitate the removal of reservations of land for public purposes where the land is no longer required for acquisition. | | |
| 7. M | etropolitan Plann | ing | | |
| 7.1 | Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036. | The objective of this direction is to give legal effect to the vision, transport and land use strategy, policies, outcomes and actions contained in the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036. | Y | The Planning Proposal is consistent with the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036. |

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?

The proposed amendments are unlikely to affect critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats. The Planning Proposal will not alter the provisions in LEP 2010 relating to the 'preservation of trees or vegetation' or 'development on natural resources sensitive land'.

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

No other environmental effects are anticipated as a result of the Planning Proposal.

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

It is considered that the Planning Proposal will have minimal social and economic effects.

Section D – State and Commonwealth interests

11. Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

The Planning Proposal does not warrant changes to the delivery of public infrastructure.

12. What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the gateway determination?

The proposal to amend the *SP2 Classified road* and *SP2 Local road* labels on the Land Zoning Map and the *Classified Road* (*SP2*) and *Local road* (*SP2*) labels on the Land Reservation Acquisition Map of LEP 2010 is to correct mapping errors. This proposal has been confirmed with the Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA). Nevertheless, in accordance with the Gateway Determination dated 5 October 2011, Council is consulting further with the RTA under section 56(2)(d) of the Act.

The proposal to amend the Lot Size Map as it applies to the property known as 39 Smeeton Road, Londonderry is to correct a mapping error. In accordance with the Gateway Determination dated 5 October 2011, Council is consulting with the NSW Rural Fire Service (RFS) under section 56(2)(d) of the Act.

Part 4 – Community Consultation

No consultation has been carried out with State and Commonwealth public authorities, with the exception of the RTA and RFS, as described above.

In accordance with the Department's guideline 'A guide to preparing local environmental plans', the Planning Proposal type is a 'low impact planning proposal', requiring an exhibition period of 14 days. Written notice and display materials have been provided in accordance with the guideline. However, it is not proposed to write to all landowners within LEP 2010, given the minor nature of the amendments.

A report on submissions will be presented to Council for its consideration following the exhibition period.

Appendix 1:

- 1. Current Application of Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 25 (Orchard Hills)
- 2. Proposed Application of Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 25 (Orchard Hills)

Appendix 2:

- 1. Noise Exposure Forecast Map in Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Second Sydney Airport
- 2. Airport Noise Map identifying land to which Clause 6.14 applies