



**BELLINGEN SHIRE COUNCIL
PLANNING PROPOSAL 12
(Version 1 – November 2017)**

**E4 (ENVIRONMENTAL LIVING) ZONE PERMISSIBLE USES
REVIEW**

THE PLANNING PROPOSAL

Pursuant to Section 55(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act), a planning proposal must be prepared before a draft Local Environmental Plan (LEP) amendment is made. The proposal must explain the intended effect of the draft LEP amendment and provide justification for the amendment. The proposal must address those matters identified by Section 55(2) of the EP&A Act, which is considered below. Council must then determine whether or not to proceed with the proposal.

History

Council resolved to proceed with the proposal at its meeting of 27 September 2017
The relevant resolution is reprinted below and the report to Council is included as Attachment 2.

ITEM: 13.7
SUBJECT: PLANNING PROPOSAL 12 - E4 (ENVIRONMENTAL LIVING) ZONE PERMISSIBLE USES REVIEW
FILE/INDEX: PLANNING PROPOSAL 12
PRESENTED BY: DANIEL BENNETT, ACTING MANAGER LAND USE SERVICES

001/17

RESOLVED (Cr Fenton/Cr Carter)

That Council:

1. Resolves to proceed with preparing a Planning Proposal to allow the following amendments to Bellingen Local Environmental Plan 2010 (BLEP 2010).
2. That the following uses are made permissible with development consent in Zone E4:
 - Secondary dwellings
 - Attached dual occupancies
 - Eco-tourist facilities
 - Tourist & visitor accommodation (with the exception of backpackers accommodation, hotel or motel accommodation and serviced apartments)
 - Home businesses
 - Rural industries
3. That Farm Buildings, within the meaning of State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt & Complying Development Codes) 2008 are included as a category of exempt development in Schedule 2 – Exempt development, of BLEP 2010, when carried out within Zone E4
4. Resolves to forward the Planning Proposal to the Department of Planning & Environment in accordance with Section 56(1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and request the issuing of a Gateway Determination to allow for the exhibition of the proposed amendment.
5. Resolves to advise the NSW Minister for Planning that it considers the proposed amendment to be of minor significance and that it intends to use its delegations to permit the General Manager to make the Local Environmental Plan.
6. Endorses the Engagement Strategy that has been proposed in this report for the public exhibition of the Planning Proposal

UNANIMOUS

Objectives

The objectives of the proposed LEP amendment are as follows:

1. To enable a wider variety of permissible land uses within Zone E4 – Environmental Living.

Proposed provisions

The provisions of the proposed LEP amendment will include:

1. Insert the following uses in Item 3 (Permitted with consent) of the land use table for Zone E4 – Environmental Living.

Dual occupancy (attached)
Eco-tourist facility
Home business
Rural industry
Secondary dwelling
Tourist & visitor accommodation

2. Insert the following uses in Item 4 (Prohibited) of the land use table for Zone E4 – Environmental Living

Backpackers accommodation
Hotel or motel accommodation
Serviced apartments

3. Insert the following item in Schedule 2 Exempt Development.

Farm buildings

Specified development

The construction or installation of a farm building used for the purpose of an agricultural activity and not used for habitable purposes is development specified for this code if it is:

- (a) constructed or installed on land in Zone E4, and
- (b) not constructed or installed on or in a heritage item or a draft heritage item or in an environmentally sensitive area.

Development standards

(1) The standards specified for that development are that the development must:

- (a) be not higher than 7m above ground level (existing), and
- (b) not have an area of more than:
 - (i) if it is a stockyard—0.5ha, or
 - (ii) if it is any other building—200m² (if situated on a lot of 2ha or more) or 50m² (if situated on a lot of less than 2ha), and
- (c) be located at least 20m from the primary road frontage of the lot and at least 10m from the other lot boundaries, and
- (d) not be constructed or installed within 50m of a dwelling on an adjoining property, and
- (e) be located at least 50m from a waterbody (natural), and

- (f) to the extent it is comprised of metal components—be designed by, and constructed in accordance with the specifications of, a professional engineer, and
- (g) to the extent it is a silo—not be fitted with a motorised fan for aeration or drying purposes.

(2) If the development is a shipping container, there must not be more than 1 shipping container per lot.

An Information Checklist, Project Timeline & Delegation Request Checklist are included as Attachments 1, 3 & 4 in accordance with the requirements of '*A Guide to preparing planning proposals*'.

SPECIFIC JUSTIFICATION FOR PLANNING PROPOSAL

A. Need for Planning proposal

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

The planning proposal has had regard to the findings of community consultation that was recently undertaken by Council regarding rural land use in Bellingen Shire. The outcomes of this consultation are fully documented in the Council Report included as Attachment 2 to this proposal.

In summary, only 12.5% of respondents to a survey undertaken as part of the Rural Lands Planning Policy Review supported the current restrictions on secondary dwellings, attached dual occupancies, new multiple occupancies and tourism development in the E4 Zone.

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

There is no alternative mechanism to permit a wider range of uses in the E4 Zone.

B. Relationship to strategic planning framework

Is the proposal consistent with the goals and directions contained within the North Coast Regional Plan?

A summary table documenting the proposals compliance with the NCRP is provided below, with detailed commentary on relevant matters provided at the end of the Table.

North Coast Regional Plan – Statement of applicability to Planning Proposal 12			
Goal	Direction	Relevant (Yes/No)	Comment
Goal 1 – The most stunning environment in NSW	Direction 1 – Deliver environmentally sustainable growth	Yes	The planning proposal retains the environmental focus of the zone.
	Direction 2 – Enhance biodiversity, coastal and aquatic habitats, and water catchments	Yes	
	Direction 3 – Manage natural hazards and climate change	Yes	The planning proposal does not seek to significantly increase development pressure in the affected areas or increase risk associated with natural hazards. Consultation will occur with key emergency services organisations, such as the NSW SES and RFS, regarding the susceptibility of these areas to risk.
	Direction 4 – Promote renewable energy opportunities	No	
Goal 2 – A thriving, interconnected economy			
	Direction 5 – Strengthen communities of interest and cross regional relationships	No	
	Direction 6 – Develop successful centres of employment	No	
	Direction 7 – Coordinate the growth of regional cities	No	
	Direction 8 – Promote the growth of tourism	Yes	The planning proposal will facilitate eco-tourism other small

North Coast Regional Plan – Statement of applicability to Planning Proposal 12			
Goal	Direction	Relevant (Yes/No)	Comment
			scale tourism developments.
	Direction 9 – Strengthen regionally significant transport corridors	No	
	Direction 10 – Facilitate air, rail and public transport infrastructure	No	
	Direction 11 – Protect and enhance productive agricultural lands	Yes	It is considered that enabling a wider variety of small scale ancillary uses in the zone will improve the likelihood of people remaining on the land, and undertaking agricultural activities.
	Direction 12 – Grow agribusiness across the region	Yes	The planning proposal will make rural industries permissible with consent in the zone.
	Direction 13 – Sustainably manage natural resources	Yes	The planning proposal does not impact upon the existing permissibility of agriculture, or other natural resource extraction activities.
Goal 3 – Vibrant and engaged communities			
	Direction 14 – Provide great places to live and work	No	
	Direction 15 – Develop healthy, safe, socially engaged and well connected communities	Yes	The planning proposal will allow for potential increased population in the E4 zones, and improved ability to provide for outcomes such as ageing in place via means such as secondary dwellings.
	Direction 16 – Collaborate and partner with Aboriginal communities	Yes	Council will engage with local aboriginal organisations and representatives as part of the public exhibition of planning proposal.
	Direction 17 – Increase the economic self-	No	

North Coast Regional Plan – Statement of applicability to Planning Proposal 12			
Goal	Direction	Relevant (Yes/No)	Comment
	determination of Aboriginal communities		
	Direction 18 – Respect and protect the North Coast's Aboriginal heritage	Yes	Council will give effect to any requests to protect aboriginal heritage arising from consultation.
	Direction 19 – Protect historic heritage	Yes	No amendments to existing heritage items are proposed.
	Direction 20 – Maintain the regions distinctive built character	No	
	Direction 21 – Coordinate local infrastructure delivery	Yes	Council has recently embarked upon a road and bridge infrastructure improvement program as part of a Special rate Variation. This will provide a suitable level of infrastructure for these areas.
Goal 4 – Great housing choices and lifestyle options			
	Direction 22 – Deliver greater housing supply	No	
	Direction 23 – Increase housing diversity and choice	Yes	The planning proposal will facilitate a more diverse range of housing opportunities in the E4 zone.
	Direction 24 – Deliver well planned rural residential housing areas	No	
	Direction 25 – Deliver more opportunities for affordable housing	Yes	The planning proposal will facilitate granny flat style development which is considered a potential source of affordable housing.

Is the proposal consistent with Council's strategic plans?

Growth Management Strategy:

Councils existing Growth Management Strategy was adopted in 2007. Its principle focus was on the investigation of potential residential and rural residential land release areas, however it did include a Chapter 9 that was entitled Rural Land Strategy. A copy of Chapter 9 is included as Attachment 5 to this report.

A review of Chapter 9, which was drafted prior to the introduction of the NSW Standard Instrument Local Environmental Plan, confirms that it did not make any explicit provisions regarding the E4 Zone and/or the Thora and Kalang valleys.

Accordingly, the provisions that are proposed in Planning Proposal 12 are not contradictory to Councils existing Growth Management Strategy.

Is the proposal consistent with applicable state environmental planning policies?

A summary table documenting the proposals compliance with relevant SEPPs is provided below, with detailed commentary on relevant matters provided at the end of the Table.

State Environmental Planning Policies – Statement of applicability to Planning Proposal 12		
SEPP	Relevant (Yes/No)	Comment
1 – Development Standards	No	
14 – Coastal Wetlands	No	
21 - Caravan Parks	No	
26 – Littoral Rainforests	No	
30 – Intensive Agriculture	No	Relates to feedlots & piggeries only
33 – Hazardous & Offensive Development	No	
36 – Manufactured Home Estates	No	
44 – Koala Habitat Protection	Yes	Council has mapped preferred koala habitat for much of the E4 Zone on Kalang Rd. The planning proposal is not contrary to the objectives of SEPP 44.
50 – Canal Estate Development	No	
55 – Remediation of Land	Yes	See comment at end of table
64 – Advertising & Signage	No	
65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development	No	
70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)	No	
Affordable Rental Housing (2009)	No	
Building Sustainability Index: BASIX (2004)	No	
Educational Establishments & Child Care Facilities (2017)	No	
Exempt & Complying Development Codes (2008)	Yes	The planning proposal seeks to make “farm

State Environmental Planning Policies – Statement of applicability to Planning Proposal 12		
SEPP	Relevant (Yes/No)	Comment
		buildings” a form of exempt development. Because Zone E4 is not a prescribed zone for the purposes of the SEPP, it has been necessary to include this in Schedule 2 of BLEP 2010. The E4 Zone allows a wide range of agricultural uses. It is appropriate that the farm buildings exemption is available to people within this zone.
Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability (2004)	No	
Infrastructure (2007)	No	
Integration & Repeals (2016)	No	
Mining, Petroleum Production & Extractive Industries (2007)	No	
Miscellaneous Consent Provisions (2007)	No	
Rural Lands (2008)	No	
State & Regional Development (2011)	No	
State Significant Precincts (2005)	No	
Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas (2017)	Yes	The E4 zone is subject to the provisions of this SEPP. The planning proposal is not inconsistent with the SEPP.

SEPP 55 – Remediation of Land

Council maintains a Contaminated Lands Information Database to guide its plan making and development assessment functions. Whilst there are no properties on this database that are confirmed as contaminated in the E4 areas, the database does list a number of properties that could potentially be contaminated by virtue of their previous uses. These include sawmills, nurseries and Rural Fire Service sheds.

Given that the planning proposal is not property specific, it is unreasonable to require investigation and remediation of all lands identified as potentially contaminated as part of the rezoning process. The fact is that these properties may not ever wish to avail themselves of the enabling provisions of the planning proposal.

SEPP 55 requires Council to be satisfied that the relevant land will be remediated before the land is used for any purpose allowed by the planning proposal. Given that Council maintains a database that is consulted as part of the development assessment and strategic planning process, it is considered that Council can be satisfied that potentially contaminated land will be identified, investigated and remediated, if required, before being used for any purpose allowed by the planning proposal.

Is the proposal consistent with applicable Section 117 directions?

A summary table documenting the proposals compliance with relevant Section 117 Directions is provided below.

Section 117 Directions – Statement of applicability to Planning Proposal 12			
117 Category	117 Direction	Relevant (Yes/No)	Comment
Employment & Resources			
	1.1 – Business & Industrial Zones	No	
	1.2 – Rural Zones	No	
	1.3 – Mining, petroleum & Extractive Industries	No	
	1.4 – Oyster Aquaculture	No	No E4 land is within a Priority Oyster Aquaculture Area
	1.5 – Rural Lands	Yes	See commentary on compliance with Rural Planning principles below.
Environment & Heritage			
	2.1 – Environment Protection Zones	Yes	Council has adopted a suite of environmental protection standards in both its LEP, and DCP, against which Development Applications are assessed. The planning proposal does not vary any development or environmental protection standards.
	2.2 – Coastal Protection	No	
	2.3 – Heritage Conservation	Yes	Council has a large number of heritage items in the relevant areas that have been identified and protected by virtue of Schedule 5 of BLP 2010. The planning

Section 117 Directions – Statement of applicability to Planning Proposal 12			
117 Category	117 Direction	Relevant (Yes/No)	Comment
			proposal does not involve any reduction in heritage protection.
	2.4 – Recreation Vehicle Areas	No	
Housing, Infrastructure & Urban Development			
	3.1 – Residential Zones	No	
	3.2 – Caravan Parks & Manufactured Home Estates	No	
	3.3 – Home Occupations	Yes	Currently permitted. No change proposed.
	3.4 – Integrating Land Use & Transport	No	
	3.5 – Development Near Licensed Aerodromes	No	
	3.6 – Shooting Ranges	No	
Hazard & Risk			
	4.1 – Acid Sulfate Soils	No	There is no land mapped as ASS in the E4 Zone.
	4.2 – Mine Subsidence & Unstable Land	No	
	4.3 – Flood Prone Land	Yes	See commentary below
	4.4 – Planning for Bushfire Protection	Yes	The planning proposal will affect bush fire prone land. Consultation with the Commissioner of the RFS will be required pursuant to Clause 4 of this direction.
Regional Planning			
	5.1 – Implementation of Regional Strategies	No	
	5.4 – Commercial & Retail Development along the Pacific Highway, North Coast	No	
	5.10 – Implementation of Regional Plans	Yes	Complies. Addressed elsewhere in this planning proposal.
Local Plan Making			
	6.1 – Approval & referral Requirements	Yes	Complies. No additional concurrence, consultation or referral requirements are proposed.
	6.2 – Reserving Land for Public Purposes	Yes	Complies. No land reserved for public

Section 117 Directions – Statement of applicability to Planning Proposal 12			
117 Category	117 Direction	Relevant (Yes/No)	Comment
			purposes.
	6.3 – Site Specific Provisions	No	The planning proposal does not relate to a particular development proposal.

Commentary; Direction 1.5 – Rural Lands

The Rural Planning Principles are as follows:

(a) the promotion and protection of opportunities for current and potential productive and sustainable economic activities in rural areas,

Comment:

The planning proposal will permit rural industries in Zone E4, which will increase the potential for productive agricultural operations.

(b) recognition of the importance of rural lands and agriculture and the changing nature of agriculture and of trends, demands and issues in agriculture in the area, region or State,

Comment:

The planning proposal will allow for a wider range of small scale land uses that can be undertaken in addition to agriculture, and support people in these areas to continue farming their properties.

(c) recognition of the significance of rural land uses to the State and rural communities, including the social and economic benefits of rural land use and development,

Comment:

The planning proposal recognises the significance of rural land uses to the state and rural communities. By allowing a wider range of small scale land uses that can be undertaken in addition to agriculture, it is expected that people in these areas may continue to be able to farm their properties.

(d) in planning for rural lands, to balance the social, economic and environmental interests of the community,

Comment:

The planning proposal will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Residents in these areas will, however, have access to the same opportunities as other rural areas to plan for social and economic trends (such as an ageing population and the profitability of agricultural pursuits) by virtue of the proposed changes to permissible land uses.

(e) the identification and protection of natural resources, having regard to maintaining biodiversity, the protection of native vegetation, the importance of water resources and avoiding constrained land,

Comment:

It is not expected that the planning proposal will have any significantly greater impact on biodiversity values, native vegetation, water resources or constrained land.

Council has already identified constrained areas in these zones by virtue of local overlays in BLEP 2010 and these will continue to be observed should the planning proposal be approved. These include, for example, Clause 7.4 (Water) and Clause 7.5 (Biodiversity).

(f) the provision of opportunities for rural lifestyle, settlement and housing that contribute to the social and economic welfare of rural communities,

Comment:

It is expected that the planning proposal will impact positively upon the social and economic welfare of communities in these areas through modest increases in population and income generating activities in these areas.

(g) the consideration of impacts on services and infrastructure and appropriate location when providing for rural housing,

Comment:

The Council is responsible for the delivery and suitable maintenance of the public roads and bridge network. Both the Kalang and Darkwood valleys are no different in character and transport infrastructure challenges than the remainder of the Shire. In addition the Council has recently embarked on a road and bridge infrastructure improvement program funded from a Special Rate Variation.

In this regard, the planning proposal will not have unacceptable impacts on services and infrastructure, and rural housing can be appropriately located with access to necessary infrastructure.

(h) ensuring consistency with any applicable regional strategy of the Department of Planning or any applicable local strategy endorsed by the Director-General.

Comment:

The planning proposals compliance with the North Coast Regional Plan has been documented earlier in this report.

Commentary: Direction 4.3 – Flood Prone Land

Council has adopted flood studies that nominate a 1% AEP level and PMF level in both the Thora & Kalang Valleys, however flood extents have not been mapped and the studies do not extend to the end of the valleys and the extent of the E4 Zones.

Council has existing development controls in Chapter 8 of the Bellingen Shire Development Control Plan 2017 that limit development on flood prone land and that will continue to apply in these areas.

For the purposes of Section (3) of Direction 4.3, the planning proposal will alter provisions within the land use table for the E4 Zone, and the E4 Zone contains flood prone land. Therefore, it is necessary to consider subclauses 4-8 of the Direction.

These are documented below.

What a relevant planning authority must do if this direction applies

(4) A planning proposal must include provisions that give effect to and are consistent with the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy and the principles of the Floodplain Development Manual 2005 (including the Guideline on Development Controls on Low Flood Risk Areas).

Comment:

The primary objective of the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy is to reduce the impact of flooding and flood liability on individual owners and occupiers of flood prone property, and to reduce private and public losses resulting from floods.

The planning proposal does not dismantle any of the protective provisions that exist within Councils Development Assessment framework and is considered to be broadly consistent with the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy.

(5) A planning proposal must not rezone land within the flood planning areas from Special Use, Special Purpose, Recreation, Rural or Environmental Protection Zones to a Residential, Business, Industrial, Special Use or Special Purpose Zone.

Comment:

Complies.

(6) A planning proposal must not contain provisions that apply to the flood planning areas which:

- (a) permit development in floodway areas,*
- (b) permit development that will result in significant flood impacts to other properties,*
- (c) permit a significant increase in the development of that land,*
- (d) are likely to result in a substantially increased requirement for government spending on flood mitigation measures, infrastructure or services, or*
- (e) permit development to be carried out without development consent except for the purposes of agriculture (not including dams, drainage canals, levees, buildings or structures in floodways or high hazard areas), roads or exempt development.*

Comment:

The planning proposal does not act to directly allow development in flood liable areas. It does seek to broaden the range of permissible uses in Zone E4, and may result in additional development in the valleys that could be isolated if public roads become impassable due to flooding, however existing flood controls are adequate to ensure that new development is not in itself liable to unacceptable flooding impacts.

During consultation that was undertaken as part of the Rural Lands Planning Policy Review, residents of the E4 Zones provided valuable feedback to Council regarding flood isolation, revealing a high level of awareness and resilience during these events. It was also noted that ongoing improvements in flood warning systems meant that residents were more informed than ever regarding potential floods and able to make appropriate arrangements in advance of any potential isolation event.

It is proposed to consult with the NSW State Emergency Service as part of the engagement strategy for the planning proposal. This will provide further clarification as to whether emergency services are adequate to cope with any potential increases in population in these areas attributable to the enabling provisions of the LEP amendment.

(7) A planning proposal must not impose flood related development controls above the residential flood planning level for residential development on land, unless a relevant planning authority provides adequate justification for those controls to the satisfaction of the Director-General (or an officer of the Department nominated by the Director-General).

Comment:

Complies.

(8) For the purposes of a planning proposal, a relevant planning authority must not determine a flood planning level that is inconsistent with the Floodplain Development Manual 2005 (including the Guideline on Development Controls on Low Flood Risk Areas) unless a relevant planning authority provides adequate justification for the proposed departure from that Manual to the satisfaction of the Director-General (or an officer of the Department nominated by the Director-General).

Comment:

Complies.

C. Environmental, social and economic impact

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 planning proposal does not directly impact upon any critical habitat, threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats.

A development assessment framework exists for Council to consider these matters should a landowner wish to avail themselves of the enabling provisions of the LEP amendment.

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

A development assessment framework exists to consider likely environmental effects should a landowner wish to avail themselves of the enabling provisions of the LEP amendment.

It is not considered necessary to insert any additional provisions into BLEP 2010 to manage likely environmental effects.

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

The planning proposal is the result of targeted consultation with residents of the E4 Zone regarding the degree to which the existing zone provisions allow, or don't allow, for certain land uses to occur that can serve the social and economic aspirations of the community.

This consultation has revealed that residents within the E4 Zone consider that existing zone provisions unreasonably prevent them from seeking certain social outcomes (such as housing an elderly relative in a secondary dwelling) or economic outcomes, (such as potentially establishing tourist and visitor accommodation).

In this regard, the planning proposal is mindful of likely social and economic effects.

D. State and Commonwealth interests

Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

The Council is responsible for the delivery and suitable maintenance of the public roads and bridge network in these localities. Both the Kalang and Darkwood valleys are no different in character and transport infrastructure challenges than the remainder of the Shire. In addition the Council has recently embarked on a road and bridge infrastructure improvement program funded from a Special Rate Variation. Accordingly, it is considered that there is adequate public infrastructure to support the planning proposal.

Views of State and Commonwealth authorities

Consultation with relevant state authorities will occur as relevant and where specified as part of the Gateway Determination.

It is proposed to consult with the following government agencies.

Issue	Agency
Water (cumulative impact attributable to increased domestic use)	NSW Office of Water
117 Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection	NSW Rural Fire Service
Flooding isolation	NSW State Emergency Services

Proposed Community consultation

The NSW Government publication "A guide to preparing local environmental plans" categorises planning proposals into "low impact proposals" or "All other planning proposals" for the purpose of determining the level of community consultation that should be undertaken.

A low impact planning proposal is a planning proposal that, in the opinion of the person making the Gateway determination, is:

- Consistent with the pattern of surrounding land use zones and/or land uses
- Consistent with the strategic planning framework
- Presents no issues with regard to infrastructure servicing
- Does not reclassify public land

It is submitted that the proposed Planning Proposal meets the criteria for "all other planning proposals", for which a minimum exhibition period of 28 days is specified.

The Bellingen Shire Council Community Engagement Strategy was adopted by Council at its Meeting 22 February 2012, and revised on 24 June 2015. This strategy is designed to outline the approach Bellingen Shire takes towards engaging with our community.

Having regard to the Strategy, it is considered that the planning proposal would be appropriately categorised as Level 2 – High impact - Local. This requires Council to "Inform, Consult, Involve & Collaborate with the community.

Noting the specific consultation that has already taken place with the community by virtue of the Rural Lands Planning Policy Review process, it is proposed that the following additional actions be undertaken to consult with the community.

- Advertise the Planning Proposal for a period of 28 days in the Bellingen Courier Sun and the Don Dorriggo Gazette.
- Notify owners of E4 land of the proposed BLEP amendment as part of the public exhibition of the Planning Proposal.
- Place notice of the Planning Proposal on the "Create" website for the duration of the exhibition period.
- Display the planning proposal, and relevant documentation, at the following locations for the duration of the exhibition period.
 - Bellingen Council Administrative Centre
 - Bellingen Library
 - Urunga Library
 - Dorriggo Library

Delegations to make plan

Council resolved as follows at the Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 November 2012 regarding the Delegation of Ministerial Functions to Council.

“RESOLVED (Cr Scott/Cr Manning)

- That Council advise the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure that it formally accepts the proposed delegations for plan making under the provisions of Section 59 of the EP and A Act 1979.*
- That, pursuant to Section 381(a) of the Local Government Act 1993, Council approve the delegation of plan making functions to the General Manager.*
- That Council advise the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure that the nominated Council Officer for the exercising of the proposed delegations for plan making is Liz Jeremy, General Manager.”*

Given the minor nature of this proposed amendment, Council has resolved to use its delegations for the making of the Plan and to inform the Department of its intention to use its delegation to make the Plan.

A copy of the Evaluation Criteria for delegated authority has also been included as Attachment 4, in further support of Council’s adopted position on this matter.

PLANNING PROPOSAL 12
VERSION 1 ATTACHMENTS INDEX
November 2017

- Attachment 1 - Information Checklist
- Attachment 2 - Report to Council & Recommendation to proceed
- Attachment 3 - Project Timeline
- Attachment 4 - Evaluation Criteria for Delegated Authority
- Attachment 5 - Rural Land Strategy