

Proposal Title : Proposal Summary :	Murray LEP 2011 – Rezone lar Residential and reduce Minim Perricoota Road, Moama Murray LEP 2011 – Rezone lar Residential and reduce Minim Perricoota Road, Moama	um Lot Size from 120ha to 750 nd from zone RU1 Primary Pro	m2 at Lot 11 DF duction to zone	P 285511, 312 R1 General
PP Number :	PP_2016_MRIVE_002_00	Dop File No :	16/09469-1	
Proposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Received	18-Jul-2016	LGA covered :	Murray River	
Region :	Western	RPA :	Murray River	Council
State Electorate :	MURRAY DARLING	Section of the Act	55 - Planning	Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning			
Location Details				
	2 Perricoota Road			0704
Suburb : Land Parcel : Lot	City : t <b>11, DP 285511</b>	Moama	Postcode :	2731
DoP Planning Office	cer Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Ella Wilkinson			
Contact Number :	0268412180	0268412180		
Contact Email :	ella.wilkinson@planning.nsw.ge	ov.au		
<b>RPA Contact Deta</b>	ils			
Contact Name :	Llyan Smith			
Contact Number :	0258843400			
Contact Email :	lsmith@murrayriver.nsw.gov.au	1		
DoP Project Manag	ger Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Wayne Garnsey			
Contact Number :	0268412180			
Contact Email :	wayne.garnsey@planning.nsw.	gov.au		
Land Release Data	a			
Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :		
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :		Consistent with Strategy :		

MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha)	7.50	Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	Residential
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	60
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? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :	There have been no known mee	tings or communications w	ith registered lobbyists
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	The subject planning proposal seeks to provide 7.5 hectares of new zone R1 General Residential land with a minimum lot size of 750m2 in the locality of Moama.		
	There is no adopted regional str draft Murray Regional Strategy ( Planning in October 2009 and w inconsistent with this draft Plan The draft Riverina- Murray Regio inconsistent with this draft Plan	draft MRS) was prepared by hile it has not been finalised onal Plan has been on exhit	y the former Department of d, the proposal is not
	A public meeting was held on th for public submissions regardin the Murray LEP 2011. The subm Planning Staff and presented to	ne 20th of May, 2014 at the M ng suggested areas for revie issions were summarised in	ew via a future amendment of n a report prepared by Councils
	On the 3rd of March, 2015, a rep recommended by the public sub Road, Moama, formed part of th The report outlined the propone zoning as the adjoining lot to th	omissions was compiled. Lo ese recommendations. nt wished to rezone Lot 11	ot 11, DP 285511, 312 Perricoota DP 285511 to share the same
	In the absence of an endorsed s adopted and used by Council, ir (MSLUP) and the Moama North not been endorsed by the Depar 2013.	trategy, the rezoning is sup ncluding the Murray Shire S West Master Plan 2008 (MN	pported in a number of plans trategic Land Use Plan WMP). While these plans have
	The proposal will provide Counc ensure a consistent supply is m term release. Council have advis is supply available for about 13	aintained in the town. Notin sed existing zoned land is n	ng this land is identified for long
	Currently, lot yield averages 8 x approximately 60 lots.	lots/ha, so the proposal ha	s the potential to yield

 The Director Regions, Western is able to determine the planning proposal although it is not supported by an endorsed strategy.

 On 12 May 2016, Murray Shire and Wakool Shire amalgamated. The proposal is consistent with the strategic direction of the former Murray Shire Council.

 Council has requested to be authorised to exercise delegation to complete the planning proposal and this is considered inappropriate as its land use strategies are not endorsed by the Department and this is a recently amalgamated Council.

 External Supporting Notes :

### Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :The planning proposal seeks to provide 7.5 hectares of new zone R1 General Residentialland with a minimum lot size of 750m2 in the locality of Moama.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The planning proposal seeks to amend the relevant Lot Size and Land Zone maps, which is consistent with the objective of the planning proposal.

### Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? No

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

- \* May need the Director General's agreement
- 1.2 Rural Zones
   1.5 Rural Lands
   3.1 Residential Zones
- 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection

Is the Director General's agreement required? No

c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?

SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008 Murray REP No. 2 - Riverine Land

e) List any other matters that need to be considered : Section 117 Directions: Council has identified that the planning proposal is considered consistent with all section 117 Directions and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPP) with the following comments except for 1.2 Rural Zones and 1.5 Rural Lands:

1.2 - Rural Zones

This direction is applicable to the proposed LEP amendment as it affects land within an existing rural zone and it is intended to rezone the site from zone RU1 Primary Production to zone R1 General Residential and reduce the minimum lot size from 120ha to 750m2.

The proposal is inconsistent with this this direction because it seeks to rezone land from a rural zone to a residential zone.

The inconsistency with this direction is not considered to be minor and further work is required before finalisation.

#### 1.5 Rural Lands

This direction is applicable to the proposed LEP amendment as it affects land within an existing rural zone and it is intended to rezone the subject land from zone RU1 Primary Production to zone R1 General Residential and reduce the minimum lot size from 120ha to 750m2.

The proposal has identified that the planning proposal affects land within a rural zone and advocates a minimum lot size for subdivision less than that permitted in the RU1 zone.

The Director Regions, Western can be satisfied in this case that the proposal is considered consistent with the Rural Lands Planning Principles expressed in the SEPP (Rural Lands) as the land, and surrounding lands, have been designated for future residential development in the MSLUP (albeit not endorsed by the Department).

The adjoining land to the south-east of the lot has already been approved for residential purposes, and is currently in the process of being developed. Whilst the proposal reduces the agricultural viability of the land, the proximity of the land to the township of Moama means the fragmentation of the rural land is considered to be minor.

There is potential for conflict between the proposed residential use and the use of adjoining land for viticulture. As this land is also designated for future residential development, a buffer between the conflicting uses is seen as appropriate until this transition occurs.

Therefore the inconsistency with this direction is not considered to be minor and further work is required before finalisation. Consultation with DPI - Agriculture is recommended to help satisfy this direction.

#### 3.1 Residential Zones

This direction is applicable to the proposed LEP amendment as it affects land within an existing or proposed residential zone (including the alteration of any existing residential boundary).

The proposal can be deemed consistent with this direction as it will provide for a greater supply of housing within Moama, broadening the choice of building types and locations available in the housing market, through the development of approximately 60 residential lots, and does not reduce the density of residential development.

The proposal will make more efficient use of existing infrastructure by utilising infrastructure currently established in Perricoota Road and the adjoining approved residential subdivision.

Finally the proposal fulfils the requirement that land must be adequately serviced prior to residential development with the MLEP containing a provision (clause 7.1) requiring development to be adequately serviced.

#### 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection

This direction is applicable to the proposed LEP amendment as it affects, or is in proximity to land mapped as bushfire prone land. A small section of Lot 11 DP 285511 is identified as being bush fire prone. At this time the proposal is inconsistent with this Direction and consultation is required

	and needs to be settled with the NSW Rural Fire Service prior to community consultation.
	5.10 Implementation of Regional Plans This Direction applies as the draft Riverina- Murray Regional Plan has been on community consultation. The proposal is not inconsistent with this draft Plan as the land is identified for future urban use.
	SEPPs:
	SEPP No 55 - Remediation of Land:
	The land is being used for intensive plant agriculture (viticulture) and as such potential land contamination needs to be investigated under SEPP 55 Remediation of Land. A
	preliminary review of the site and initial site contamination report are to be prepared and placed on public exhibition to and Council is to satisfy the requirements of SEPP 55.
	State Environmental Pleaning Policy (Purel Lande) 2009
	State Environmental Planning Policy (Rural Lands) 2008 The planning proposal is generally consistent because rezoning the land to zone R1
	General Residential is outlined as the preferred future land use of the land, and is generally compatible with the current surroundings.
	The second has sufficed that there is not satisfied for conflict between the proposed
	The proponent has outlined that there is potential for conflict between the proposed residential use and the use of adjoining land for viticulture. As this land is also
	designated for future residential development, a buffer between the conflicting uses is
	seen as appropriate until this transition occurs.
	The proposal is to be referred to DPI-Agriculture during public exhibition to help resolve the requirements of the Rural Lands SEPP.
	SEPP No 44 – Koala Habitat Protection Council have identified that the subject land does not contain any vegetation that is a koala feed tree species and therefore consider that the site does not have potential to be a koala habitat. The planning proposal is consistent with this SEPP. This matter will be considered as part of Council's merit assessment for a development application.
	Murray Regional Environmental Plan No 2 – Riverine Land (MREP 2) The proposal is generally consistent with the MREP 2 and specific development will be assessed, and applicable agencies will be consulted at development application stage.
Have inconsistencies with	items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? <b>Yes</b>
If No, explain :	
Mapping Provided - s5	5(2)(d)
Is mapping provided? No	
Comment :	Indicative mapping provided. Mapping prepared in accordance with DPE technical guidelines will be required for submission at section 59 stage.
Community consultation	on - s55(2)(e)
Has community consultation	on been proposed? <b>Yes</b>
Comment :	The applicant has noted that at a minimum, they expect the planning proposal will be exhibited for a period of 28 days in accordance with the requirements of section 57 of

the EP&A Act 1979 and that this will include various forms of consultation. This is

considered appropriate. **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? Yes If No, comment : **Proposal Assessment Principal LEP:** Due Date : December 2011 Comments in relation Murray LEP 2011 notified on 16 December, 2011 to Principal LEP : **Assessment Criteria** Need for planning The planning proposal is a result of public submissions provided to Council in regards to a proposal :

planningThe planning proposal is a result of public submissions provided to Council in regards to a:review via a future amendment of the Murray LEP 2011. The submissions were compiledinto a report, which outlined the proponent wished to rezone Lot 11 DP 285511 to share thesame zoning as the adjoining lot to the east, seeking to rezone from RU1 PrimaryProduction. A planning proposal is the only way to achieve this outcome.

Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The land is identified in both the MSLUP and MNWMP as being appropriate for residential development. The MSLUP recommends Lot 11 DP 285511 be made available for residential land as part of Stage 2 release, which is currently still in Stage 1. The proposal will provide for potential 60 new R1 lots in Moama out of sequence.
	The MNWMP recommends release of the land during the latter stages of land release in Moama.
	The release of the land at Lot 11 DP 285511 is justified by the MSLUP which outlines land to the north and either side of Martin Road should be made available when supply drops below 15 years, with current supply at approximately 13.8 years.
	Council provided information on 18 July 2016 to justify supply and demand.
	Further, the site adjoins an existing approved residential subdivision and is considered to have strategic merit as the site can be connected to existing services and incorporated to the road and infrastructure corridors outlined in the MNWMP.
	The proposal is consistent with the draft Murray Regional Strategy and draft Riverina Murray Regional Plan in that, while it outlines the intent to rezone RU1 Primary Production land, the proposal does not fragment agricultural land and is not considered to pose a significant impact to resource availability or agricultural efficiency. The proposal has outlined a buffer will be implemented between residential uses and viticulture adjoining the site, until such time as the vines are removed on the adjoining site for future residential purposes.
	The planning proposal can be supported, as the proposal has strategic merit. The release of the land for urban uses, while not technically occurring in the earmarked Stage 2 release, is appropriate given Council's need to maintain 15 years of urban release for Moama as outlined in the MNWMP. While there is no endorsed strategy for this area of the Murray River Council, the land has been identified in two strategic documents used by the Murray River Council. Finally the proposal will not result any adverse effects on resource availability or agricultural efficiency and is consistent with the draft Riverina Murray Regional Plan.
	In addition the land is located between land currently being developed for urban purposes.
Environmental social economic impacts :	The rezoning of land from zone RU1 Primary Production to zone R1 General Residential and reduce Minimum Lot Size from 120ha to 750m2 at Lot 11 DP 285511, 312 Perricoota Road, Moama does not pose any immediate environmental impacts. The land is not covered by Councils biodiversity mapping in the MLEP, and falls outside the 1 in 100 year flood zone.
	A section of the site is mapped as bush fire prone and as a result, the Department has conditioned that the NSW Rural Fire Service is consulted under section 59(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, prior to community consultation to satisfy section 117 Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection.
	Positive social and economic impacts are expected, providing for a greater supply of housing within Moama, broadening the choice of building types and locations available in the housing market.

# **Assessment Process** Consistent Community Consultation 28 Days Proposal type Period : **RPA** 12 months Delegation : Timeframe to make LEP : Public Authority Office of Environment and Heritage Consultation - 56(2)(d) NSW Department of Primary Industries - Agriculture **NSW Rural Fire Service** Is Public Hearing by the PAC required? No Yes (2)(a) Should the matter proceed ? If no, provide reasons : Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required, i 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 Is Public DocumentType Name **Document File Name** 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

	4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection	
Additional Information	1. 1. Prior to community consultation being undertaken consultation is required with the NSW Rural Fire Service under section 56(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 to comply with the requirement of section 117 direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection. Council is to forward the NSW Rural Fire Service response to the Department and seek approval to proceed to community consultation.	
	2. Prior to community consultation Council is to ensure that the planning proposal satisfies the requirements of State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) 55 –	

**3.1 Residential Zones** 

	Remediation of Land. An initial site contamination investigation report is to be prepared to demonstrate that the land is suitable for rezoning to the proposed R5 zone. The preliminary review of the subject land by Council and initial site contamination investigation report are to be forwarded to the Department seeking approval so that such reports can be placed on public exhibition with the planning proposal. 3. Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the
	Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 as follows: (a) The planning proposal is required to be made publicly available on exhibition for 28 days as described in A Guide to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning and Infrastructure 2013).
	(b) The relevant planning authority must comply with the notice requirements for public exhibition of planning proposals as identified in section 5.5.2 of A Guide to Preparing LEPs.
	<ul> <li>4. Consultation is required with the following public authorities under section 56(2)(d) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 and/or to comply with the requirements of relevant section 117 Directions:</li> <li>Office of Environment and Heritage</li> <li>Department of Primary Industries - Agriculture</li> </ul>
	Each public authority is to be provided with a copy of the planning proposal and any relevant supporting material, and given at least 21 days to comment on the proposal.
	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 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979. 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. The LEP maps shall be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Department's "Standard Technical Requirements for Spatial Datasets and Maps" (2015).
	7. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 12 months from the week following the date of Gateway determination.
	8. Murray River Council not be authorised to exercise delegation.
Supporting Reasons :	The amendment to the Land Zoning Map and Minimum Lot Size map in the Murray LEP 2011 to allow the subject land to be developed for general residential is considered appropriate and the Director Regions, Western can use delegation as the proposal is consistent with local strategic planning (albeit not endorsed by the Department) and broader Government Policy.
Signature:	
Printed Name:	Ella Nilleinson Date: 2/8/2016
Endonapo	
A/Camer	2/8/16
TIMR	cy 2/8/16