

Proposal Title :	Amendment No 12 to Port Mac Port Macquarie and Oxley Hig		o Rezone Land at	Fernbank Creek
Proposal Summary :	Planning Proposal to rezone la environmental conservation a Wauchope (Site 2) for resident Port Macquarie Hastings LEP Buildings Map Sheets.	nd protection purposes and tial use. The proposal will in	l land at Yippen C volve amendmen	reek, West t to the relevant
PP Number :	PP_2012_PORTM_006_00	Dop File No :	12/14440	
roposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Received :	06-Sep-2012	LGA covered :	Port Macqua	rie-Hastings
Region :	Northern	RPA:	Port Macqua	rie-Hastings Counc
State Electorate :	PORT MACQUARIE	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning	l Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning			
Location Details		3		5 9
Street : Fe	rnbank Creek Road and Pacific H	lighway		
Suburb : Fe	rnbank Creek City :	Port Macquarie	Postcode :	2444
Land Parcel : Lo	t 1 DP 222740, Lot 229 DP 754434	and Lot 1 DP 318920		
Street : Ox	aley Highway			
Suburb : Yi	open Creek City :	West Wauchope	Postcode :	2446
Land Parcel : Pa	rt of Lot 2 DP 1036844			
DoP Planning Off	icer Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Denise Wright			
Contact Number :	0266416630			
Contact Email :	denise.wright@planning.nsw.g	ov.au		
RPA Contact Deta	ils			
Contact Name :	Stephen Nicolson			
Contact Number :	0281852900			
Contact Email :	stephen.nicolson@pmhc.nsw.g	gov.au		Ű.
	iger Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Jim Clark			
Contact Number :	0266416604			
Contact Email.:	jim.clarl@planning.nsw.gov.au			

Land Release Data

Growth Centre :	N/A	12	Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Mid North Coast Regional Strategy		Consistent with Strategy :	Yes
MDP Number :			Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha)			Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	Both
No. of Lots :	26		No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	0
Gross Floor Area	0		No of Jobs Created :	0

The NSW Government Yes Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :

If No, comment :

Have there been	No
meetings or	
communications with	
registered lobbyists?:	

If Yes, comment :

Supporting notes

Internal Supporting Notes :

External Supporting Notes :

Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment : The objectives and intended outcomes of the Planning Proposal are adequately expressed for the proposed amendment to Port Macquarie Hastings LEP 2011

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment : The Planning Proposal provides a clear explantion of the intended provisions to achieve the objectives and intended outcomes

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :	
* May need the Director General's agreement	

- 1.2 Rural Zones 1.5 Rural Lands 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones
- 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport

4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008 d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? e) List any other matters that need to be considered : Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Mapping is provided to identify the land. Draft amending Land Zoning, Lot Size, Floor Comment : Space Ratio and Height of Buildings Map Sheets are provided. The mapping is suitable for exhibition purposes. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes The RPA suggests a 28 day consultation period would be adequate. The proposal is Comment : consistent with the regional planning framework, presents no issues with regard to infrstructure provision, is not a principal LEP, and does not reclassify public land. The propsoed 28 day exhibition period is therefore considered suitable **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 :

Comments in relation **Port Macquarie LEP 2011 published in February 2011.** to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal : SITE 1 at the corner of the Pacific Highway and Fernbank Creek Road is developed as the Cassegrain Winery (food and wine based rural tourism) and has a total area of 38ha. It has been established for about 15 years. Council notes that this area is one of only two clearly recognisable rural tourist precincts in the LGA which is suitable for investigation as a

dedicated specialist tourist precinct ancillary to the existing development. The proposed zoning of the site is from RU1 Primary Production to part SP3 Tourist with residual vegetation on the site proposed as either E2 Environmental Protection or E3 Environmental Conservation.

An amendment to the LEP is the only means for achieving the objectives of permitting a specialist tourism precinct at the subject site, continuing the tourist related opportunities and appropriate protection of native vegetation.

The Planning Proposal identifies a net community benefit with the opportunity to to secure an important local tourism precinct and protect and manage environmentally sensitive areas of the site for benefit of the local community.

Council advice is that a range of specialist studies are required prior to the proposal proceeding to public exhibition, including:

Site Survey Cultural and Archaeological Heritage Assessment Ecological Assessment Bushfire Assessment Access, Traffic and Movement Assessment Servicing Strategy Geotechnical and Wastewater Assessment

At this time the work has not commenced.

The Department discussed with Council the practicality of the current Grouped Amendment and to ascertain whether Council wished to proceed with Site 1 and 2 as separate planning proposals. It is noted that Site 1 and Site 2 are contained on separate Map Sheets and there is no real benefit to be gained in processing as one planning proposal. However Council declined to alter the current planning proposal noting that consideration would be given to splitting the items if there was to be a significant delay.

SITE 2 adjoining the Oxley Highway at Yippen Creek, within the West Wauchope Urban Release Area. The site is a small flood free area of land adjoining the existing R1 General Residential Zone.

An amendment to the LEP is the only means of achieving the objectives of permitting residential use of the site.

The Planning Proposal identifies a net community benefit with the provision of additional land supply and low density housing opportunities and economic benefits to the community.

Consistency with strategic planning framework :

Site 1 is an existing tourist site and Council's view is that the proposed ancillary expansion is consistent with the strategic objectives for tourism provided in the approved Port Macquarie Urban Growth Management Strategy 2011. The Strategy is based on the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy.

Site 2 is part of a larger area identified for future urban growth in the Port Macquarie Hastings Urban Growth Management Strategy. The proposal is to extend the existing urban footprint over a small area of land to supply infill, low impact, low density housing opportunities (about 26 lots).

Council has identified ten (10) 117 Directions and SEPP-RuralLands as being relevant to the proposal.

The Planning Proposal is consistent with all relevant s117 Directions and SEPP Rural Lands with the exception of Directions 1.2 Rural Zones, 1.5 Rural Lands, 4.3 Flood Prone Land and 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection. These inconsistencies may be justified for the following reasons:

Direction 1.2 Rural Zones. Direction 1.2 provides that a planning proposal shall not rezone land from rural to residential or tourist, or contain provisions which will increase the permissible density of land within a rural zone. Site 1 of the planning proposal seeks to rezone the existing Cassegrain Winery development to part SP2 Tourist and Site 2 involves rezoning of a small area of land from rural to residential. Direction 1.2 provides that a planning proposal may be inconsistent with this direction if the provisions which are inconsistent are justified by a strategy, a study or a regional strategy or are of minor significance. Council considers the proposal for Site 1 involves ancillary development to the existing food and wine based rural tourist use of the land and is consistent with the strategic abjectives for tourism provided in the approved Port Macquarie Urban Growth Management Strategy. Site 2 involves land located within a proposed future urban release area as identified by the MNCRS. Therefore the inconsistency of the planning proposal with the direction is justified by reasons of minor significance and by the relevant strategies.

Direction 1.5 Rural Lands provides that a planning proposal should not affect land within a rural or environmental protection zone or reduce the minimum lot size applying to land unless consistent with the Rural Planning Principles or Rural Subdivision Principles in SEPP (Rural Lands). The planning proposal seeks to rezone rural land for tourist use (Site 1) and urban use (Site 2). The direction provides that a draft plan may be inconsistent with this direction if the land is identified in a strategy which considers the objectives of this direction and is approved by the Director General of the Department or the rezoning is of minor significance. In this case the proposal is considered of minor significance (upgrading an existing tourist area) or is land identified as a proposed future urban release area in the MNCRS. The inconsistency of the proposal with the direction is therefore justified.

4.3 Flood Prone Land - is relevant as the proposal alters a provision affecting flood prone land at Fernbank Creek (Site 1). The Direction provides that a Planning Proposal may be inconsistent with the Direction if a flood risk management plan has been prepared or the provisions of the Planning Proposal that are inconsistent are of minor significance.

The Flood Planning Maps of the Port Macquarie Hastings LEP 2011 identify the 'flood planning area' subject to LEP Clause 7.3 Flood planning which requires consideration of potential flood impacts both on and off the subject land. Most of the development footprint is above the 1% AEP level but partially within the Flood Planning Area. The provisions of the LEP require future residential and ancillary development to be commensurate with the flood hazard and have regard for management of the flood risk. The inconsistency with Direction 4.3 is considered to be justified as being of minor significance.

e	prone land. A Bushfire proposal in accordance mitigation measures to provided for Site 1. Cou	or Bushfire Protection applies as the Hazard Assessment has been prepa with the Planning for Bushfire Prote be implemented on the land. A bush ncil is required to consult with the N sistent with the Direction until this c	red to support th action Guidelines fire assessment ISW Rural Fire Se	e Site 2 and identifies is yet to be
Environmental social economic impacts :		the existing Cassegrain Winery run e and development of a specialised		
2 -		will provide appropriate protection a regetation on Site 1 and provides im		
	provides a positive soci	nal housing at Site 2, in proximity to al and economic impact within the o al issues identified to impact on the	community. There	e are no
Assessment Process	5			
Proposal type :	Minor	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	12 Month	Delegation :	DG	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Office of Environment a NSW Rural Fire Service Transport for NSW - Roa	nd Heritage ads and Maritime Services		
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No		
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes		
If no, provide reasons :				ů,
Resubmission - s56(2)(b): No			
If Yes, reasons :				
Identify any additional st	udies, if required. :			
If Other, provide reasons	s :			
Identify any internal cons	sultations, if required :			
No internal consultation	n required			
	ling of state infrastructure	relevant to this plan? No		
If Yes, reasons :				
ocuments				
Document File Name		DocumentType Na	ame	Is Public
PP2011-0009 s56 Subm Am 12 Site ID Sheet 01		Proposal Map		Yes Yes

Am 12 Site ID Sheet 013C 20120815.pdf	Мар	Yes	
6380_COM_LZN_010B_020_20120815.pdf	Мар	No	
6380_COM_LZN_013C_020_20120815.pdf	Мар	No	
6380_COM_FSR_010B_020_20120815.pdf	Мар	No	
6380_COM_HOB_010B_020_20120815.pdf	Мар	No	
6380_COM_LSZ_010B_020_20120815.pdf	Мар	No	
PMHC Covering Letter Amendment No 12.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	No	

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
- 2.3 Heritage Conservation
- 3.1 Residential Zones
- 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
- 4.3 Flood Prone Land
- 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
- 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies
- 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
- 6.3 Site Specific Provisions

It is recommended that:

Additional Information :

1. the planning proposal proceed as a minor planning proposal.

2. the Director General agree that inconsistencies with S.117 Directions 1.2 Rural Zones and 1.5 Rural Lands are justified as of minor significance;

3. the Director General note that the inconsistency with Direction
4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection will be justified when Council consults with the Rural Fire Service.

4. Consultation is required with the following public authorities under section 56(2)(d) of the EP&A Act:

- Office of Environment and Heritage
- . NSW Rural Fire Service
- Roads and Maritime Services

Each public authority is to be provided with a copy of the planning proposal, and any relevant supporting material; in particular each authority should receive a copy of the specific technical study that relates to the authorities area of interest. Each public authority is to be given at least 21 days to comment on the proposal, or to indicate that they will require additional time to comment on the proposal. Public authorities may request additional information or additional matters to be addressed in the planning proposal.

5. Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the EP&A Act as follows:

(a) the planning proposal must be made publicly available for 28 days; and (b) the relevant planning authority must comply with the notice requirements for public exhibition of planning proposals and the specifications for material that must be made publicly available along with planning proposals as identified in section 4.5 of A Guide to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning 2009).

6. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 12 months from the week following the date of the gateway determination.

Supporting Reasons :

The reasons for the above recommendation for Site 1 and Site 2 are as follows: 1. The proposal will secure an important local tourism precinct and protect and manage

	environmentally sensitive areas of the site for benefit of the local community
	2. The proposed residential use of the land is consistent with all relevant local and regional planning strategies
Signature:	