

Proposal Title :	Kyogle LEP 2012 – Amendment #8 Temporary Workers' Accommodation and Roadside Stalls.		
Proposal Summary :	 Listing roadside stalls wh Primary Production and RU2 F Making temporary worker RE2 Private Recreation zones 	ich are less than 8m2 in siz Rural Landscape zones, sub s' accommodation permiss by listing temporary worke	e as exempt development in the RU1
PP Number :	PP_2016_KYOGL_001_00	Dop File No :	16/04507
oposal Details			
Date Planning Proposal Received :	24-May-2016	LGA covered :	Kyogle
Region :	Northern	RPA :	Kyogle Council
State Electorate :	LISMORE	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Policy		
ocation Details			
Street :			
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :
Land Parcel : The	e proposal applies to various land	l parcels in the Kyogle loca	l government area.
DoP Planning Offic	cer Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Paul Garnett		
Contact Number :	0266416607		
Contact Email :	paul.garnett@planning.nsw.gov	au	
RPA Contact Detai	ils		
Contact Name :	Lachlan Black		
Contact Number :	0266320293		
Contact Email :	lachlan.black@kyogle.nsw.gov.a	au	
DoP Project Manaç	ger Contact Details		
Contact Name :			
oondouradine .			

Stalls.			
Land Release Data			
Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Far North Coast Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy :	No
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	Residential
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 :		nd Environment's Code of Prac	tice in relation to
ii No, conment :		s with lobbyists has been comp	
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No		
If Yes, comment :		s not met any lobbyists in relati eeting between other officers w	ion to this proposal, nor has the vithin the agency and lobbyists
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :			
External Supporting Notes :			
Adequacy Assessmen	t		
Statement of the obj	jectives - s55(2)(a)		
Is a statement of the ob	jectives provided? Yes		
Comment :	intends to: 1. increase opportunities 2. support agricultural en temporary or seasonal agric	for agricultural producers to se terprises by improving opportu	nities for accommodation for
Explanation of provi	sions provided - s55(2)(b)		
Is an explanation of pro-	visions provided? Yes		
Comment :	objectives of the planning p 1. amend the LEP to list re	ns adequately addresses the in proposal. The proposal intends oadside stalls which are less th mary Production and RU2 Rura	an 8m2 in size as exempt

talls.		
2 i	n the RU1, RU2 and R	make temporary workers accommodation permissible with consent RE2 Private Recreation zones by listing temporary workers dwelling itted use in Schedule 1 of the LEP.
i: 4	s to be amended to b residential accommo	onsultation Part 2 Explanation of Provisions of the planning proposal etter clarify that 'temporary workers' accommodation' is a type of dation'. This clarification should be included in the proposed local to Part 6 of the Kyogle LEP 2012 and the entry to Schedule 1.
Justification - s55 (2)(c)		
a) Has Council's strategy be	en agreed to by the Di	irector General? Yes
b) S.117 directions identified	l by RPA :	1.2 Rural Zones
* May need the Director Ger	neral's agreement	 1.5 Rural Lands 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 5.3 Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 3.6 Shooting Ranges
Is the Director General's a	agreement required? \	fes
c) Consistent with Standard	Instrument (LEPs) Orc	ler 2006 :
d) Which SEPPs have the R	PA identified?	SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008 SEPP (Temporary Structures and Places of Public Entertainment) 2007
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :		
Have inconsistencies with ite	ems a), b) and d) being	adequately justified? Yes
If No, explain :		section of his report.
Mapping Provided - s55	(2)(d)	
Is mapping provided? No	\=/ \ ₩/	
Comment :	The proposed ameno and no maps are req	Iment to the Kyogle LEP 2012 will affect the written instrument only uired.
Community consultation	n - s55(2)(e)	
Has community consultation	been proposed? Yes	
		al does not nominate a community consultation period.
	considered that the p proposes changes th identified in a Local (A Guide to Preparing Local Environmental Plans" (the 'Guide'), it is planning proposal is not a low impact planning proposal as it hat affect large areas of the LGA and have not previously been Growth Management Strategy that has been reviewed by the wider de suggests written notification to the affected and adjoining land

	owners however this is impractical for a wide ranging proposal. It is therefore considered that a community consultation period of 28 days is appropriate.
dditional Director	General's requirements
Are there any addition	al Director General's requirements? No
If Yes, reasons :	
verall adequacy o	of the proposal
Does the proposal me	et the adequacy criteria? Yes
If No, comment :	Time Line The planning proposal includes a project timeline which estimates the completion of the planning proposal in July 2016. To ensure the RPA has adequate time to complete exhibition, reporting, and legal drafting, it is recommended that a time frame of 12 months is appropriate.
	Delegation. The RPA has requested an Authorisation to exercise delegation for this proposal. An Evaluation Criteria For the Delegation of Plan Making Functions has been provided. The proposal is considered to be of local planning significance. It is recommended that an Authorisation for the execution of delegation be issued to the RPA in this instance.
	 Overall Adequacy The planning proposal satisfies the adequacy criteria by; 1. Providing appropriate objectives and intended outcomes. 2. Providing a suitable explanation of the provisions proposed for the LEP to achieve the outcomes. 3. Providing an adequate justification for the proposal. 4. Outlining a proposed community consultation program. 5. Providing a project time line 6. Completing the evaluation criteria for the delegation of plan making functions.

Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Comments in relationThe Kyogle LEP 2012 is in force. This planning proposal seeks an amendment to the Kyogleto Principal LEP :LEP 2012.

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :	The planning proposal is not the result of a specific strategy or study. Council has recognised that there is a need to support the agricultural sector in the local government area (LGA) by providing additional and more streamlined opportunities for development that directly supports agriculture.
	Roadside Stalls Roadside stalls are presently permitted with consent in the RU1 Primary Production and RU2 Rural Landscape zones in Kyogle LEP 2012. Clause 5.4 of Kyogle LEP limits the size of roadside stalls to 8m2. Council considers the need for development consent unreasonable for such small developments. Council proposes to make roadside stalls which are less than 8m2 in size exempt development.
	In addition to the maximum size limit of 8m2, roadside stall will only be exempt development when; 1. They are proposed to be located within the RU1 and RU2 zone or on a road reserve

 directly fronting a property within these zones;
2. They are located on a private property or the consent of the road authority has been
given to locate them in a road reserve;
3. They are no less than 100m from an intersection of two roads;
4. They must be for the sale of agricultural produce farmed or processed on the subject
property;
5. There is adequate vehicle parking and sight lines; and,
6. They are not to be operated at night.
These development controls are considered to be suitable for roadside stalls as exempt
development subject to consultation with the RMS. Should a proponent wish to construct a
roadside stall which does not comply with these standards, the development application
pathway is available to consider the proposal.
Temporary Workers' Accommodation
Council has recognised that the development of large scale horticultural enterprises in the
region has required a substantial number of seasonal workers to travel to the region.
Appropriate accommodation for these seasonal workers has not been available resulting
in them often camping illegally creating issues for Council and the community.
Council is therefore seeking to introduce provisions in its LEP to allow and control
development for temporary workers' accommodation so as to regularise this land use
while ensuring that the agricultural industries which rely on seasonal workers have access
to this resource.
Council has also identified that a similar need for temporary workers may arise with large
infrastructure projects in the region and intends to make temporary workers'
accommodation available for these workers as well.
It is considered that the proposed amendments to the LEP are the most appropriate means
of facilitating the intention of the planning proposal.
Council has identified a net community benefit for roadside stalls as exempt development
and for permitting temporary workers' accommodation with consent.

Consistency with strategic planning	Far North Coast Regional Strategy (FNCRS). The proposal is not inconsistent with the actions and outcomes in the FNCRS.
ramework :	
	The proposal to make small roadside stalls exempt development is not inconsistent with
	the provisions of the FNCRS. The FNCRS does not contain any actions or outcomes specific
	to the development of roadside stalls however this proposal will enable increased
	opportunities for rural landholders to improve the resilience of the rural economy. This is
	consistent with the vision of the FNCRS for a sustainable future, healthy, prosperous and
	diverse communities.
	Temporary workers' accommodation is a land use that has not been considered by the
	FNCRS. Council has sought to define temporary workers accommodation as:
	" any habitable buildings and associated amenities erected on a temporary basis for the
	purpose of providing a place of temporary or short term accommodation for persons employed on projects for or to support agricultural production, including associated
	infrastructure projects."
	Additionally Council has defined short term accommodation as:
	"accommodation that may be seasonal or for the duration of the completion of a
	development for or to support agricultural production in the area."
	Temporary workers' accommodation (TWA) is therefore best described as an innominate
	form of residential accommodation. Council intends to permit TWA with consent in the RU1
	and RU2 zones. In this regard the proposal is inconsistent with the FNCRS as it will
	potentially enable additional residential accommodation outside of the town and village
	growth boundaries in rural areas unsupported by a local growth management strategy.
	The FNCRS states that rural residential development will be located close to centres with
	an adequate level of services. The proposal does not include similar requirements for TWA
	and therefore TWA development may potentially be located in isolated locations with limited access to infrastructure and services.
	To address potential impacts of TWA developments Council has prepared a draft
	development control plan. The Draft DCP provisions included in the planning proposal
	include provisions which address:
	1. Protection of agricultural land;
	2. Land use conflict;
	3. Design and siting of buildings and structures;
	4. Visual impact;
	5. Environmental impact;
	 Protection of amenity of surrounding properties; Effluent and stormwater management;
	 Effluent and stormwater management; 8. Transport and access;
	9. Natural hazards; and,
	10. Heritage
	The take up rate for TWA developments is expected to be relatively low. Additionally
	camping grounds, dual occupancies, rural workers dwellings and secondary dwellings,
	which are developments with similar potential impacts, are all currently permissible in
	these rural zones.
	As a result of the permissibility of similar developments, the proposed DCP controls, the
	expected low takeup for TWA developments and the temporary nature of TWA
	dsevelopments, the inconsistency of the proposal with the FNCRS is considered to be of
	minor significance as the proposal achieves the overall intent of the strategy which, as
	detailed in the planning proposal, seeks to develop healthy, prosperous and diverse
	communities and a sustainable future. It is considered that regulating temporary workers accommodation in the shire and supporting the agricultural sector will contribute
	positively to the rural community and the sustainable future of Kyogle LGA.
	positively to the rular community and the sustainable future of Nyogie LGA.

Draft North Coast Regional Plan

The proposal is not inconsistent with the Draft North Coast Regional Plan (the 'Draft RP'). Like the FNCRS, the Draft RP has not given consideration to the issue of temporary workers accommodation in rural zones.

The draft plan has similar requirements to the FNCRS in relation to only permitting new rural residential developments in accordance with approved strategies and consistent with the Settlement Panning Guidelines. In this regard the proposal is considered to be inconsistent with the Draft Regional Plan in the same manner as it is considered to be inconsistent with the FNCRS. Equally the inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance given the Draft DCP provisions which will guide the location of these proposed temporary workers accommodation.

The draft plan states that councils will need to limit dwellings in rural zones not associated with agriculture, or outside of rural residential areas, to avoid potential land use conflict with agricultural activities. The proposal includes draft DCP requirements which raise this issue as a matter to be addressed by the development application.

The draft plan does however support complimentary activities in rural zones and to this end the Action 1.2.1 of the draft plan states that the NSW Government will investigate appropriate complimentary activities in rural zones that promote the development of a stronger agricultural sector and will not adversely affect agricultural activities. In this regard the proposal is considered to be consistent with the draft plan.

Consistency with Council's Local Strategies.

Kyogle Community Strategic Plan 2012-2025 (the 'CSP') The proposal is consistent with Council's CSP. Both components of the proposal will contribute to supporting the agricultural industry, and reversing the decline of services in rural areas. There is no local growth management strategy for Kyogle LGA which is

relevant to the proposed amendments to the LEP.

SEPPs

The proposal lists the State environmental planning policies (SEPPs) applicable to the land. Many SEPPs apply to the subject land and the proposal is not inconsistent with these SEPPS.

SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 (the 'Codes SEPP') The proposal is not inconsistent with the SEPP. The Codes SEPP does not list roadside stalls as exempt development and therefore the proposal to include roadside stalls as exempt development in Kyogle LEP 2012 is not inconsistent with the Codes SEPP.

SEPP 44 Koala Habitat Protection

The proposal to permit TWA with consent is not inconsistent with the SEPP as the provisions of the SEPP will continue to apply to development applications for TWA that result from the proposed amendments to the LEP.

SEPP 55 Remediation of Land

The proposal to permit TWA with consent is not inconsistent with the SEPP. The proposal does not rezone specific land and only enables the consideration of a development application for TWA. Due to the fact the proposal will permit TWA with consent in a range of zones (RU1, RU2 and RE2) and therefore over a wide area of land it is not possible to conduct preliminary site contamination assessments until development applications are lodged with the consent authority.

SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008

SEPP Rural Lands (the RLSEPP) contains Rural Planning Principles to guide development on rural land. The proposal provides an assessment against these principles. The proposal to permit roadside stalls as exempt development and permit TWA with consent is considered to be consistent with the rural planning principles for the following reasons:

1. The proposal recognises the importance of rural land and agricultural uses in the
region and will contribute to the promotion and protection of sustainable economic
activities in rural areas;
2. The proposal recognises the changing nature and trends of agriculture in the region
and aims to provide small scale retail outlets and accommodation for temporary works to
compliment the changing agriculture industry; and,
3. The proposal considers the social and economic interests of the community by
providing an outlet for the sale of agricultural produce and enabling a mechanism for
regulating the accommodation of temporary workers to minimise the impact on the
community.
The second to exclude TMMA with according to the DHA and DHA more in incomplete standard
The proposal to enable TWA with consent in the RU1 and RU2 zones is inconsistent with
the principles as it does not utilise a strategic approach to the location of what is in effect residential accommodation in rural areas. Permitting TWA with consent in rural zones has
not taken into account the potential impacts on natural resources, State or regionally
significant farmland, and constrained land, the potential impacts on other forms of rural
lifestyle, settlement and housing, and the consideration of impacts on services and
infrastructure for residential accommodation in potentially isolated localities.
The planning proposal indicates that the Kyogle DCP will be amended to include
guidelines that will protect the potential and viability of good quality agricultural land,
avoid the potential for land use conflict and ensure development for TWA responds
appropriately to ecological values and natural hazards. A copy of the draft chapter of the
DCP is included as an attachment to the planning proposal. While these matters can be
addressed to some degree through the development application process, it would be
beneficial for the planning for TWA if Council developed a more comprehensive heads of
consideration clause for the location of TWA to include in the LEP.
It is considered that the inconsistency of the proposal with the Dural Planning Principles is
It is considered that the inconsistency of the proposal with the Rural Planning Principles is of minor significance
or minor significance
The proposal is otherwise consistent with State environmental planning policies.
S117 Directions.
The following S117 directions are applicable to the proposal, 1.2 Rural Zones, 1.3 Mining,
Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries, 1.5 Rural Lands, 2.1 Environmental
Protection Zones, 2.3 Heritage Conservation, 2.4 Recreational Vehicle Areas, 3.1
Residential Zones, 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates, 3.3 Home
Occupations, 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport, 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning
for Bushfire Protection, 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies, 5.3 Farmland of State
and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast, 6.1 Approval and Referral
Requirements, 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes, and 6.3 Site Specific Provisions.
Of the above s117 Directions the proposal is considered to be inconsistent with Direction
1.5, 2.1, 2.3, 4.3, 4.4 and 5.1.
Direction 1.2 Rural Zones is relevant to the proposal. The direction provides that a
planning proposal must not rezone land from a rural to a residential zone. The planning
proposal does not seek to rezone rural land, instead it proposes to permit with consent,
temporary workers accommodation in certain zones. The proposal is not considered to be
inconsistent with this direction.
Direction 1.5 Rural Land is relevant to the planning proposal. The direction provides that a
planning proposal that affects rural land must be consistent with the Rural Planning Principles in the SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008. An assessment of the proposal with the rural
planning principles is discussed previously in this report. The proposal with the rural
some of the principles since it does not utilise a strategic approach to the location of what
is in effect residential accommodation in rural areas. Permitting TWA with consent in rural
zones has not taken into account the potential impacts on natural resources, State or
regionally significant farmland, and constrained land, the potential impacts on other forms

of rural lifestyle, settlement and housing, and the consideration of impacts on services and infrastructure for residential accommodation in potentially isolated localities.

The inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance since the potential for TWA to be developed is considered to be low and the impacts on the environment and the suitability of subject sites can be addressed through Council's proposed DCP provisions and at development application stage. The inconsistency of the proposal with the direction is therefore considered to be justified in accordance with the terms of the direction.

Direction 2.1 Environmental Protection Zones is relevant to the planning proposal. The direction provides that a planning proposal must include provisions that facilitate the protection and conservation of environmentally sensitive areas. The proposal seeks to permit TWA on land in rural areas that may contain environmentally sensitive areas. The proposal includes a draft heads of consideration clause however this draft clause does not require consideration of the potential impacts of TWA on environmentally sensitive areas. The proposal also includes a draft chapter for Kyogle DCP which will be include guidelines to ensure ecological values are protected from inappropriate TWA. The potential environmental impact of a proposed development, in this case TWA, is required to be considered by a consent authority under section 79C of the Act and therefore the inconsistency of the proposal with the direction is considered to be of minor significance and justified in accordance with the terms of the direction.

Direction 2.3 Heritage Conservation is relevant to the planning proposal. The direction provides that a planning proposal must contain provisions which facilitate the conservation of items and places of heritage significance. The proposal will permit TWA with consent on land that may have Aboriginal or European heritage significance. Given the range of land zones on which TWA will be permitted and the resulting wide area of potential subject land it is appropriate that the conservation of potential heritage significance on this land is addressed at development application stage. It is therefore considered that the inconsistency of the proposal with this direction is of minor significance and is therefore justified in accordance with the terms of the direction.

Direction 4.3 Flood Prone land is relevant to the proposal. The direction provides that a planning proposal shall not permit a significant increase in the development of flood prone land. The proposal is inconsistent with this direction as in some cases it is envisaged that TWA may be proposed on flood prone land. It is considered this inconsistency is of minor significance as Kyogle LEP contains controls for development on flood prone land which must be addressed at development application stage. The inconsistency is therefore considered to be justified in accordance with the terms of the direction.

Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection is relevant to the proposal. Areas of the LGA that will be subject to the proposal to permit temporary workers accommodation are identified as being bush fire prone. The direction provides that the RPA must consult with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service, and the draft plan must include provisions relating to bushfire control. Consultation with the RFS is required after a Gateway Determination is issued and before public exhibition and until this consultation has occurred the inconsistency of the proposal with the direction remains unresolved.

Direction 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies is relevant to the proposal. The direction provides that a planning proposal must be consistent with the regional strategy. As discussed previously in this report the proposal is considered to be inconsistent with the Far North Coast Regional Strategy. This inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance as the proposal achieves the overall intent of the strategy. The inconsistency is therefore considered to be justified in accordance with the terms of the direction.

The proposal is otherwise consistent with S117 Directions.

Environmental social economic impacts :

The proposal will permit temporary workers accommodation with consent on a wide range of land in various zones. The potential impact of these developments on critical habitat or threatened species will be assessed at development application stage and this is appropriate as it is not possible to predict where these development are likely to be

proposed and therefore determine whether the land is of ecological significance.

The other expected environmental impacts from temporary workers accommodation have been addressed by Council in its draft DCP provisions. As previously discussed these provisions cover a wide range of expected impacts and land constraints which will need to be addressed at development application stage.

It is anticipated that the proposal will have a positive economic and social impacts by providing support for labour resources for the agricultural sector and regulating the location of temporary workers accommodation to ensure it does not have an adverse impact on rural communities.

Agency Consultation.

- It is considered that the RPA should consult with the following State agencies:
- 1. Roads and Maritime Services;
- 2. Rural Fire Service;
- 3. Department of Primary Industries Agriculture; and
- 4. Office of Environment and Heritage.

Assessment Process

Proposal type :	Routine		mmunity Consultation riod :	28 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	12 months	De	legation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Office of Environme NSW Department of NSW Rural Fire Ser Transport for NSW	Primary Industr			
Is Public Hearing by the I	PAC required?	Νο			
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes			
If no, provide reasons :					
Resubmission - s56(2)(b)) : No				
If Yes, reasons :					
Identify any additional stu	idies, if required. :				
If Other, provide reasons	,				
Identify any internal cons	ultations, if required :				
No internal consultation	required				
Is the provision and fundi	ng of state infrastruct	ure relevant to thi	s plan? No		
If Yes, reasons :					
Documents					
Document File Name			DocumentType Na	ime	Is Public

Planning Team Recom	nendation
Preparation of the planning	ng proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions
S.117 directions:	 1.2 Rural Zones 1.5 Rural Lands 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 5.3 Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 3.6 Shooting Ranges
Additional Information :	It is recommended that the planning proposal should proceed subject to the following;
	1. The planning proposal proceed as a 'routine' planning proposal.
	2. A community consultation period of 28 days is necessary.
	3. The planning proposal is to be completed within 12 months.
	 4. The RPA is to consult with the following State agencies and organisations; a. Roads and Maritime Services; b. Rural Fire Service; c. Department of Primary Industries - Agriculture; d. Office of Environment and Heritage; and
	5. A written authorisation to exercise delegation be issued to Kyogle Council.
	6. The Secretary's delegate agree that the inconsistency of the proposal with S117 Directions 1.5, 2.1, 2.3, 4.3 and 5.1 are justified in accordance with the terms of the direction.
	7. The Secretary's delegate note that the potential inconsistency with S117 Direction Planning for Bushfire Protection remains unresolved until after consultation with the NSW RFS.
	8. Prior to community consultation Part 2 Explanation of Provisions of the planning proposal is to be amended to better clarify that 'temporary workers' accommodation' is a type of 'residential accommodation'. This clarification should be included in the proposed local provision to be added to Part 6 of the Kyogle LEP 2012 and the entry to Schedule 1.
Supporting Reasons :	 The reasons for the recommendation are as follows; 1. The proposal recognises the importance of the agricultural industry in the region and will contribute to the promotion and protection of sustainable economic activities in rural areas; 2. The proposal recognises the changing nature and trends of agriculture in the region and aims to provide small scale retail outlets and accommodation for temporary works to compliment the changing agriculture industry; 3. The potential impacts of permitting temporary workers accommodation with consent can be adequately addressed through DCP provisions and the development application process; and, 4. The proposal's inconsistencies with the strategic planning framework are considered to be of minor significance.

Signature:		
Printed Name:	Crang Diss Date:	3616