



Contact: Ian Grant

19 September 2012

Ms M.McIntyre
Department of Planning and Infrastructure
PO BOX

Dear Meredith

Re: Proposed Rezoning of Land at Gumly Gumly from RU1 Primary Production, to B6 Enterprise Corridor

As recommended by the Department, the attached amended Planning Proposal relates only to the land identified as Lot 1 DP 305732 and Lot 1 DP 1085667, 3870 Sturt Highway. The land to the east of these lots and not currently covered by the RPS Study Document – along with all the land included in Council's proposed B6 enterprise Corridor precinct for Gumly, will be the subject of a separate Planning Proposal.

The purpose of this letter is to address the range of concerns relating to all components of the proposed B6 Enterprise Corridor precinct, raised by the Department in previous emailed correspondence.

As recommended, Council has added significant detail to part 3 – Justification, of the Planning Proposal, including that of the combined opportunity to prevent further industrial ribbon development along the highway to the east, while providing for an integrated form of development on both sides of the highway, to clarify the entry point to Wagga Wagga proper.

In relation to the Department's concern that the proposed northern boundary of the proposed B6 zone not being consistent with 'the boundary proposed by the applicant in the RPS study', we can confirm that RPS and its client agree on the location of the boundary and agree that the Flood Impacts Assessment undertaken by WMA Water does not contradict this position; that map simply identifies land to be filled as distinct from that which does not require fill.

In relation to the current anomaly between the 'small portion of land on the western boundary of the site', as between Council's proposed B6 precinct and that in the RPS Study, Council included only those lots with direct access to the Sturt Highway. However, because the currently excluded portion is owned by an owner of land accessing the Highway', Council has amended its proposed B6 precinct map to include that small portion of land.

In relation to the Department's question about the RE1 zoned land proposed to be included in the B6 zone, the reason for the existence of that zone in relation to the dwelling facing the highway dates back to a pre-LEP exhibition time and is unknown to current staff. However, because that zoning logically covers the large public park at the rear of the dwelling, it appears as though there has simply been a glitch in defining the zone boundary. It is intended that only the RE1 as applying to the dwelling lots will change.

As previously advised, the RE1 zoned land is privately owned and therefore does not require reclassification.

In relation to the Department's comments on the B6 enterprise corridor Land Use Table and on the zone objectives, we advise as follows:

- The zone objectives are now included in the body of the Planning Proposal.
- 'Home businesses' and 'home occupations' have been removed from the 2 'permitted without consent' schedule, while remaining in that of 4. 'Prohibited'. The purpose of this is to prevent further such development in the future, as being inconsistent with the long-term zone objectives.
- As requested, we have added; 'hardware and building supplies; hotel or motel accommodation' and 'business premises' to the 'Permitted with consent' schedule – as both motel and marine sales exist in the near vicinity and any possible 'business premises' are not considered likely to have any adverse impacts on the city centre.
- In relation to the question of the need for the land use table to 'provide for' a range of use including offices, we accept your advice and have amended the land use table accordingly.

Yours sincerely



Ian Grant
Manager Strategic Planning