

Planning Team Report

Proposal Title :	Gunnedah LEP 2012 - 110 Kamilaroi Hwy, Gunnedah - Industrial land rezoning				
Proposal Summary ;	The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Gunnedah LEP 2012 by rezoning part of Lot 2 DP 858991, 110 Kamilaroi Highway, Gunnedah from RU1 Primary Production and RU6 Transition to IN1 General Industrial and by removing the minimum lot size for the same area. This change in zone and minimum lot size will enable the development of the land for industrial purposes consistent with a development approval for an industrial land subdivision under the former Gunnedah LEP 1998.				
PP Number	PP_2014_GUNNE_004_00	Dop File No :	14/15460		
posal Details			and the second sec		
Date Planning Proposal Received :	10-Sep-2014	LGA covered :	Gunnedah		
Region :	Northern	RPA :	Gunnedah Shire Council		
State Electorate :	TAMWORTH	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal		
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning				
cation Details Street : 11	0 Kamilaroi Highway				
Suburb :	City :	Gunnedah	Postcode : 2380		
Land Parcel : Pa	art of Lot 2 DP 858991				
oP Planning Off	icer Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Jon Stone				
Contact Number :	0267019688				
Contact Email :	jon.stone@planning.nsw.gov.a	u			
PA Contact Det	ails				
Contact Name :	Carolyn Hunt				
Contact Number :	0267402122				
	carolynhunt@infogunnedah.co	m.au			
Contact Email :	ager Contest Details				
Contact Email : OP Project Mana	ager contact Details				
	ayer Contact Details				

and Release Data			
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	N/A	Consistent with Strategy :	
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :	14.00	Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	Employment Land
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	0
Gross Floor Area	0	No of Jobs Created :	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :			
If No, comment :	communications and me Region's knowledge. Th this proposal, nor has th	ning and Environment's Code of Pra eetings with lobbyists has been corr e Northern Region has not met with ne Northern Region been advised of nd lobbyists concerning the propos	plied with to the best of the any lobbyists in relation to any meeting between other
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	Determination failed to i land. The FSR would be	vised that the Planning Proposal sul nclude the application of a Floor Sp consistent with nearby industrial zo way Determination, if approved, requ to exhibition.	ace Ratio (FSR) of 0.6:1 to the oned land. Council has
External Supporting Notes :	developed for industrial Council in 2010 for an in industrial purposes und	ent to the Gunnedah LEP 2012 will e purposes consistent with a develop idustrial land subdivision. The land, er the Gunnedah LEP 1998. With th land was rezoned to RU1 Primary F	oment application approved by at that time, was zoned for e commencement of the
equacy Assessmer	it		internal provides
Statement of the ob	jectives - s55(2)(a)		
	jectives provided? Yes		
Comment :	The objectives and in	ntended outcomes of the Planning P endment to Gunnedah LEP 2012.	roposal are adequately expressed
Explanation of prov	isions provided - s55	i(2)(b)	
ls an explanation of pro	visions provided? Yes		
Comment :		al provides a clear explanation of th tended outcomes.	e intended provisions to achieve

ustification - s5	5 (2)(c)	
a) Has Council's str	ategy been agreed to by the D	Director General? <b>Yes</b>
b) S.117 directions i		1.2 Rural Zones
* May need the Director General's agreement		1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries 1.5 Rural Lands
		3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes 4.3 Flood Prone Land
Is the Director G	eneral's agreement required?	
	itandard Instrument (LEPs) Or	
	ve the RPA identified?	SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection
d) which SEPPS ha	ve the RPA identified?	SEPP No 55
		SEPP No 64—Advertising and Signage
		SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008
		SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007
		SEPP (Intrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Major Projects) 2005
		SEPP (Major Projects) 2005 SEPP (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries)
		SEPP (mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive industries) 2007
		2007 SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008
	1.0	
e) List any other matters that need to	-	orth West Strategic Regional Land Use Plan applies to the
be considered :		
	es with items a), b) and d) beir	ng adequately justified? Yes
If No, explain :		ng adequately justified? Yes
If No, explain :	od - s55(2)(d)	ng adequately justified? <b>Yes</b>
If No, explain : <b>//apping Provide</b>	d - s55(2)(d) d? Yes Maps have been pro land zoning and min	ng adequately justified? Yes ovided with the Planning Proposal. They clearly show the current nimum lot sizes applying to the site, the proposed land zoning and for the land. It is considered that these maps are adequate for public
If No, explain : <b>/lapping Provide</b> Is mapping provided	nd - s55(2)(d) d? Yes Maps have been pro land zoning and min minimum lot sizes f exhibition. Map prepared in acc	ovided with the Planning Proposal. They clearly show the current nimum lot sizes applying to the site, the proposed land zoning and
If No, explain : <b>/lapping Provide</b> Is mapping provided	ed - s55(2)(d) d? Yes Maps have been pro- land zoning and min minimum lot sizes f exhibition. Map prepared in ac need to be prepared It is recommended	ovided with the Planning Proposal. They clearly show the current nimum lot sizes applying to the site, the proposed land zoning and for the land. It is considered that these maps are adequate for public cordance with the Department's technical mapping standards will
If No, explain : <b>fapping Provide</b> Is mapping provided Comment :	ed - s55(2)(d) d? Yes Maps have been pro- land zoning and min minimum lot sizes f exhibition. Map prepared in acc need to be prepared It is recommended the proposed chang	ovided with the Planning Proposal. They clearly show the current nimum lot sizes applying to the site, the proposed land zoning and for the land. It is considered that these maps are adequate for public cordance with the Department's technical mapping standards will d before a Parliamentary Counsel's opinion can be sought.
If No, explain : <b>Iapping Provide</b> Is mapping provided Comment : Community cons	ed - s55(2)(d) d? Yes Maps have been pro- land zoning and min minimum lot sizes f exhibition. Map prepared in ac- need to be prepared It is recommended to the proposed changesite. sultation - s55(2)(e)	ovided with the Planning Proposal. They clearly show the current nimum lot sizes applying to the site, the proposed land zoning and for the land. It is considered that these maps are adequate for public cordance with the Department's technical mapping standards will d before a Parliamentary Counsel's opinion can be sought. that additional maps be included in the Planning Proposal showing ges to the Floor Space Ratio Map by applying a FSR of 0.6:1 to the
If No, explain : <b>Japping Provide</b> Is mapping provided Comment : Community cons Has community cons	ed - s55(2)(d) d? Yes Maps have been pro- land zoning and min minimum lot sizes f exhibition. Map prepared in acc need to be prepared It is recommended the proposed chang site. sultation - s55(2)(e)	ovided with the Planning Proposal. They clearly show the current nimum lot sizes applying to the site, the proposed land zoning and for the land. It is considered that these maps are adequate for public cordance with the Department's technical mapping standards will d before a Parliamentary Counsel's opinion can be sought. that additional maps be included in the Planning Proposal showing ges to the Floor Space Ratio Map by applying a FSR of 0.6:1 to the
If No, explain : <b>Iapping Provide</b> Is mapping provided Comment : Community cons	ed - s55(2)(d) d? Yes Maps have been pro- land zoning and min minimum lot sizes f exhibition. Map prepared in acc need to be prepared It is recommended the proposed chang site. sultation - s55(2)(e) asultation been proposed? Yes	ovided with the Planning Proposal. They clearly show the current nimum lot sizes applying to the site, the proposed land zoning and for the land. It is considered that these maps are adequate for public cordance with the Department's technical mapping standards will d before a Parliamentary Counsel's opinion can be sought. that additional maps be included in the Planning Proposal showing ges to the Floor Space Ratio Map by applying a FSR of 0.6:1 to the
If No, explain : Mapping Provide Is mapping provided Comment : Community cons Has community con Comment :	ed - s55(2)(d) d? Yes Maps have been pro- land zoning and min minimum lot sizes f exhibition. Map prepared in acc need to be prepared It is recommended the proposed chang site. sultation - s55(2)(e) asultation been proposed? Yes	ovided with the Planning Proposal. They clearly show the current nimum lot sizes applying to the site, the proposed land zoning and for the land. It is considered that these maps are adequate for public cordance with the Department's technical mapping standards will d before a Parliamentary Counsel's opinion can be sought. that additional maps be included in the Planning Proposal showing ges to the Floor Space Ratio Map by applying a FSR of 0.6:1 to the southority has identified a 14 day exhibition period for the onsidered satisfactory.
If No, explain : Mapping Provide Is mapping provided Comment : Community cons Has community con Comment : Additional Direct	ed - s55(2)(d) d? Yes Maps have been pro- land zoning and min minimum lot sizes f exhibition. Map prepared in ac- need to be prepared It is recommended in the proposed chang site. sultation - s55(2)(e) sultation been proposed? Yes The relevant planni proposal. This is co	ovided with the Planning Proposal. They clearly show the current nimum lot sizes applying to the site, the proposed land zoning and for the land. It is considered that these maps are adequate for public cordance with the Department's technical mapping standards will d before a Parliamentary Counsel's opinion can be sought. that additional maps be included in the Planning Proposal showing ges to the Floor Space Ratio Map by applying a FSR of 0.6:1 to the s ng authority has identified a 14 day exhibition period for the onsidered satisfactory.

## Overall adequacy of the proposal

Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes

If No, comment :

The Planning Proposal and accompanying documentation are considered to satisfy the adequacy criteria by:

1. Providing appropriate objectives and intended outcomes;

2. Providing a suitable explanation of the provisions proposed by the LEP to achieve the outcomes;

3. Providing an adequate justification for the proposal;

- 4. Outlining a proposed community consultation program; and
- 5. Providing a project time line.

Council is seeking an authorisation to exercise its plan making delegations. As the Planning Proposal deals with matters of only local significance, it is considered appropriate that an authorisation to exercise its plan making delegations be issued to Council, if the Planning Proposal is supported.

Council has provided a project time line which estimates that the LEP will be ready for submission to the Department for finalisation in November 2014. To ensure an adequate period to complete the proposal, a 6 month time frame is recommended.

It is also noted that the subject land is not identified on Council's Flood Planning Map as being subject to flooding. This is an error in the flood mapping data due to the interface of two different flood studies. Council's flood study of the town finishes in the vicinity of the subject land and the less accurate Namoi Flood Atlas (1978) does not correlate with the Gunnedah Flood study in this location. Despite this, Council has identified the site as being subject to flooding in a 1% AEP event. This is also evident in the conditions of consent for the subdivision of the land in 2010 that requires all utility and development areas of the site to be filled above the 1% AEP level. An attached aerial photograph of a flood event in 1998 shows the subject land inundated.

## Proposal Assessment

## Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Comments in Gunnedah LEP 2012 was made on 29 June 2012. relation to Principal LEP :

#### **Assessment Criteria**

Need for planning proposal :

A development application for the subdivision of the subject land was approved by Council in May 2010. At the time the subject land was zoned 4(a) General Industrial under the Gunnedah LEP 1998.

Council's Commercial and Industrial Land Use Strategy was adopted by Council in 2008. Due to the land being subject to flooding and the significant costs associated with developing the site, it was not included in the Strategy's land inventory. During the preparation of the draft comprehensive LEP it was proposed to rezone the land to RU1 Primary Production and RU6 Transition (a buffer for the Gunnedah Sewage Treatment Plant). No submissions were received during the exhibition of the draft LEP on the subject and the land was subsequently rezoned by the Gunnedah LEP 2012.

With the continued growth of the resource sector in the Region the owner of the land now wishes to develop it in accordance with the approved subdivision. Although the approved subdivision can still proceed, subject to conditions of consent being met, no industrial use of the land would be permissible. Hence, Council is seeking to rezone the land back to an industrial use as it was at the time the subdivision application was determined.

Whilst the Planning Proposal aims to rezone the land and amend the minimum lot size it is also considered appropriate that a floor space ratio (FSR) be applied to the site. Other land, similarly zoned IN1 General Industrial has a 0.6:1 FSR applied to it. It is considered that this land should also have this FSR applied to ensure consistency with the scale of development with other industrial land. Council staff have confirmed their support for the inclusion of the FSR and identified that it was an oversight in the Planning Proposal.

Consistency with strategic planning framework :

The Planning Proposal is not the result of any strategic study or report.

It is considered to be consistent with all relevant SEPPs and the New England North West Strategic Regional Land Use Plan.

The Gunnedah Commercial and Industrial Land Use Strategy 2008 does not address this site in its recommended land use zoning because of potential constraints of the site, namely flooding and the cost associated with filling the site above the 1% AEP flood level. Despite this, the land had previously been zoned for industrial purposes (until the commencement of the Gunnedah LEP 2012) and a subdivision was approved by Council with the intent the site be used for industrial purposes. It is considered that reapplying an industrial zoning is not inconsistent with Council's strategic planning work as it will only be reflective of an existing approved subdivision.

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with all applicable Section 117 Directions apart from the following:

#### **1.2 Rural Zones**

The Planning Proposal seeks to rezone rural land to IN1 General Industrial. The inconsistency with this Direction is considered to be of minor significance due to the size of the land involved, its location adjacent to other industrial lands, its former 4(a) General Industrial zoning until 2012 and the nature of the existing approved subdivision applying to the land

1.5 Rural Lands

The Planning Proposal will affect land within an existing rural zone and changes the existing minimum lot size on land within that zone. The inconsistency with this Direction is considered to be of minor significance due to the size of the land involved in this Planning Proposal and for the reasons discussed above in relation to S117 Direction 1.2 Rural Zones.

3.5 Development near Licensed Aerodromes

The Planning Proposal will alter a zone within the vicinity of the Gunnedah airport. The site is approximately 1.3km from the runway but outside the Obstacle Limitation Surface Area for the airport. No ANEF mapping exists for the airport and the inconsistency with this Direction is considered minor due to the size of the site, the scale of any likely development under the proposed 0.6:1 FSR, the intermittent use of the airport and the surrounding industrial development in the locality.

#### 4.3 Flood Prone Land

The Planning Proposal will affect land that is flood prone. Although the site is not identified on the Flood Planning Map due to inconsistencies with flood study data, it is known to be flood prone as shown in the attached aerial photograph of the 1998 flood event. The inconsistency with this Direction is considered to be of minor significance due the conditions of consent for the approved subdivision of the land already requiring all utility services and development site to be located above the 1% AEP level.

Council also identified an inconsistency with direction 1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries as they believe it will affect the permissibility of mining on the subject land. An examination of the land use table for the IN1 zone in the Gunnedah LEP 2012 reveals that mining is permissible with consent and therefore the Planning Proposal is consistent with the direction. It is also noted that mining in this area is highly unlikely due to the proximity to Gunnedah.

Environmental social economic impacts : It is considered that this Planning Proposal will have positive social and economic impacts through its provision of additional industrial land for Gunnedah as it experiences continued growth due to the resources sector. The site is cleared and is unlikely to include areas of endangered ecological communities or koala habitat. It is not bush fire prone but as previously discussed is flood prone. Consultation with the Office of Environment and Heritage is therefore recommended. Council has identified that the Planning Proposal is consistent with the SEPP 55 Remediation of Land. It is unlikely that the site is contaminated.

Access to the site is via the Kamilaroi Highway. Consultation with the Roads and Maritime Service is recommended. It is understood that the RMS was consulted during the assessment of the development application for the subdivision of the site in 2010 and that the consent included requirements for upgrading the access to the site.

## **Assessment Process**

2014-09-10 Council R 1998-Flood-Event.jpg		Proposal Photograph		Yes Yes
2014-09-10 Cover Let 2014-09-10 Planning		Proposal Cov Proposal	ering Letter	Yes Yes
Document File Name		DocumentType		Is Public
ocuments				
If Yes, reasons :				141
Is the provision and fu	nding of state infrastru	cture relevant to this plan? No		
No internal consultati	ion required			
Identify any internal co	onsultations, if required	:		
If Other, provide reaso	ns :			
Identify any additional				
If Yes, reasons :				
Resubmission - s56(2)	(b) : <b>No</b>			
If no, provide reasons				
(2)(a) Should the matte	er proceed ?	Yes		
Is Public Hearing by th	e PAC required?	Νο		
Consultation - 56(2) (d) :	Transport for NSV	V - Roads and Maritime Services		
Public Authority		ment and Heritage		
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 months	Delegation :	RPA	
Proposal type :	Minor	Community Consultation Period :	n <b>14 Days</b>	

## Planning Team Recommendation

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

S.117 directions:	1.2 Rural Zones			
1	1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries			
	1.5 Rural Lands			
	3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes			
	4.3 Flood Prone Land			
Additional Information :	It is recommended that:			
	1. The Planning Proposal be supported;			
	2. The Planning Proposal be exhibited for 14 days;			
	3. The Planning Proposal be completed within 6 months;			
	4. The Planning Proposal be amended to include a floor space ratio to the site of 0.6:1;			
	5. That the Planning Proposal be amended to identify that the site is subject to flooding;			
	6. That consultation with the Office of Environment and Heritage and Transport for NSW -			
	Roads and Maritime Services be undertaken;			
	7. That an authorisation to exercise delegation be issued to Council;			
	8. That the Director General's delegate determine that the inconsistencies with s117			
	Direction 1.2 Rural Zones, 1.5 Rural Lands, 3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes			
	and 4.3 Flood Prone Land are justified as the matters are of minor significance.			
Supporting Reasons :	This Planning Proposal will facilitate the development of more industrial land uses on a site that had previously been zoned for that purpose and for which an application for the subdivision of the site for industrial purposes has been approved by Council. It will also facilitate the efficient extension of Council utility services infrastructure in the longer term. The potential impact on the environment is considered to be minor.			
	100			
Signature:				
	$I = \rho I I I$			
Printed Name:	Like Blandford Date: 15/9/14			
A	Team Leader			