

Net Community Benefit

From a

**Proposed Rezoning of Land
Lots 11, 12, 13, 46 and 227 DP 755980
Kentucky Rd, Boggabilla**

**Client: Bedajama Pty Ltd
C/- SMK Consultants Pty Ltd
PO Box 774 MOREE NSW 2400**

July 2013

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
NET COMMUNITY BENEFIT TEST.....	1
1. Will the LEP be compatible with agreed state and regional strategic directions for development in the area?.....	1
2. Is the LEP located in a global/regional city, strategic centre or corridor nominated within the Metropolitan Strategy or other regional/subregional strategy?	1
3. Is the LEP likely to create a precedent or create or change the expectations of the landowner or other landholders?	1
4. Have the cumulative effects of other spot rezoning proposals in the locality been considered? What was the outcome of these considerations?.....	2
5. Will the LEP facilitate a permanent employment generating activity or result in a loss of employment lands?.....	2
6. Will the LEP impact upon the supply of residential land and therefore housing supply and affordability?	2
7. Is the existing public infrastructure (roads, rail, utilities) capable of servicing the proposed site?.....	2
8. Is there good pedestrian and cycling access?	2
9. Is public transport currently available or is there infrastructure capacity to support future public transport?.....	2
10. Will the proposal result in changes to the car distances travelled by customers, employees and suppliers? If so, what are the likely impacts in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, operating costs and road safety?.....	2
11. Are there significant Government investments in infrastructure or services in the area whose patronage will be affected by the proposal? If so, what is the expected impact?	2
12. Will the proposal impact on land that the Government has identified a need to protect (e.g. land with high biodiversity values) or have other environmental impacts? Is the land constrained by environmental factors such as flooding?	2
13. Will the LEP be compatible/complementary with surrounding land uses? What is the impact on amenity in the location and wider community?	3
14. Will the public domain improve?.....	3
15. Will the proposal increase choice and competition by increasing the number of retail and commercial premises operating in the area?	3
16. If a stand-alone proposal and not a centre, does the proposal have the potential to develop into a centre in the future?	3
17. What are the public interest reasons for preparing the draft plan? What are the implications of not proceeding at this time?	3
CONCLUSION.....	3

INTRODUCTION

This report examines the Net Community Benefit that would result from a planning proposal submitted to Moree Plains Shire Council. The planning proposal seeks to amend the principle LEP as it applies to Lots 11, 12, 13, 46 and 227 in Deposited Plan 755980.

BACKGROUND

A rezoning submission was lodged with Council during the preparation of the PlanFirst LEP in 2004/5 to rezone the land for rural residential purposes. Due to the State Government's introduction of the Standard Instrument (Local Environmental Plans) order 2005 the rezoning did not proceed at that time. In 2007 another approach was made to Council who, in consultation with State Government, requested additional studies, including in relation to the expected Net Community Benefit that would result from the proposal. The following examines the proposal from this aspect.

NET COMMUNITY BENEFIT TEST

1. Will the LEP be compatible with agreed state and regional strategic directions for development in the area?

As discussed in the planning proposal report the planning proposal is generally consistent with the *Strategic Regional Land Use Plan: New England North West*.

2. Is the LEP located in a global/regional city, strategic centre or corridor nominated within the Metropolitan Strategy or other regional/subregional strategy?

No.

3. Is the LEP likely to create a precedent or create or change the expectations of the landowner or other landholders?

The land owner has formally requested Council to rezone the site to meet unmet demand for rural residential and small lot rural development in close proximity to the regional town of Goondiwindi. Given this and the recommendation in pages 221-223 of the Moree Plains Shire Growth Management Strategy, the matter of changing the zoning has already been in part assessed and approved by Council and the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. The surrounding land has already been the subject of subdivision to provide rural residential lot sized land areas. As these are fully developed and utilised, the zoning changes as proposed in this report may not create expectations for adjoining landholders to proceed with similar zoning requests. The landholders to the south and west of the subject land are adjacent to higher value and more viable areas of intensive irrigated cropping. The proximity of this adjoining intensive agriculture land would limit the potential rezoning of more land for smaller rural residential subdivision to the west or south. The land to the east of the subject land would have some potential for closer subdivision without resulting in conflict with intensive agricultural farming areas.

4. Have the cumulative effects of other spot rezoning proposals in the locality been considered? What was the outcome of these considerations?

There have been no other spot rezonings in the locality.

5. Will the LEP facilitate a permanent employment generating activity or result in a loss of employment lands?

Rezoning the land would permit unmet housing demand from professional and business owners to be met. No employment is directly included in the proposal. Indirect employment would occur as a result of the need to construct and service new dwellings and the related infrastructure.

6. Will the LEP impact upon the supply of residential land and therefore housing supply and affordability?

The proposal would increase the supply of housing land that is in short supply in the locality.

7. Is the existing public infrastructure (roads, rail, utilities) capable of servicing the proposed site?

Yes. Additional road and water supply infrastructure would be provided by the proponent to service the proposal.

8. Is there good pedestrian and cycling access?

Pedestrians and cyclists would be able to use the existing and proposed road network.

9. Is public transport currently available or is there infrastructure capacity to support future public transport?

Roads suitable for public transport are available or would be provided by the land owner, however, no public transport is presently available other than a school bus service. This may change with increasing population density which could improve the commercial viability of public transport in the locality.

10. Will the proposal result in changes to the car distances travelled by customers, employees and suppliers? If so, what are the likely impacts in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, operating costs and road safety?

By reducing rural residential lot sizes from the present standard of 100 hectares car trip distances would be reduced due to increased population density closer to town.

11. Are there significant Government investments in infrastructure or services in the area whose patronage will be affected by the proposal? If so, what is the expected impact?

The Goondiwindi town water supply would be extended to service the proposal. This water supply has adequate unused capacity and the proposal would provide additional income to the Goondiwindi Regional Council.

12. Will the proposal impact on land that the Government has identified a need to protect (e.g. land with high biodiversity values) or have other environmental impacts? Is the land constrained by environmental factors such as flooding?

The land is not protected land.

Although the land is subject to inundation during flooding in the Macintyre River system a comprehensive flood study has revealed that the land would be classified as low hazard flood prone land under the NSW Floodplain Development Manual criteria.

**13. Will the LEP be compatible/complementary with surrounding land uses?
What is the impact on amenity in the location and wider community?**

Immediately adjoining land uses comprise rural residential and agriculture which are identical to the proposed land uses contained within this proposal.

14. Will the public domain improve?

The proposal will require the extension of the Goondiwindi town water supply and provision of additional roads and the upgrading of some existing roads and stormwater drainage systems. These improvements would be funded by the proponent at no cost to the general public.

15. Will the proposal increase choice and competition by increasing the number of retail and commercial premises operating in the area?

By accommodating additional population the proposal would increase retail activity by introducing additional consumers which in turn would improve the viability of local businesses.

16. If a stand-alone proposal and not a centre, does the proposal have the potential to develop into a centre in the future?

The Planning Proposal applies to land that will be predominantly zoned residential adjacent to a town centre. It is unlikely that the site will become a commercial centre in the future.

17. What are the public interest reasons for preparing the draft plan? What are the implications of not proceeding at this time?

It is vital to proceed with this Planning Proposal given the importance of providing dwellings to meet present unmet demand and for the future growth of the population.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing assessment of the potential net community benefit from this proposal the assessment has determined that there would be a positive net benefit to the community from the proposal and that the positive benefits would outweigh any possible negative outcomes.